

The Huxley Press, Madras.

AHIMSA AND WORLD PEACE

AHIMSA AND WORLD PEACE

OR THE CASE FOR NON-VIOLENCE

WITH

THE VICTORY OF PEACE: Three Poems

BY

WILFRED WELLOCK

WITH A PREFACE BY

DWIJENDRANATH TAGORE



S. GANESAN,

PUBLISHER, TRIPPLICANE, MADRAS, S. E.

26 AHIMSA AND WORLD PEACE

We are not savages, and it is no use pretending that we are. The savage delights in war because it is natural to him. He knows no other way. But with us it is different. We have other faculties and powers at our disposal, other avenues for developing and manifesting our heroism. And the time has come when we ought to know it.

Consider India, for instance. India comprises of most varied elements: people as cultured and refined as any that are to be found on the earth's surface; yet vast hordes who are steeped in appalling ignorance. But India is willing and anxious to educate these, so that, provided we act honourably towards India, she will never be the least menace to the West. India is essentially a peace-loving nation; and I personally know a large number of highly-cultured Indians who, for religious and humanitarian reasons, abhor the very name of war. But repress and despise India, persist in looking upon her as the white man's spoil, and upon Indians generally as inferior beings, incapable of civilisation and self-government, and fit only to be slaves, and she *may* become a menace. And what is true of India is also largely true of China and Japan.

If for sordid and commercial reasons we act towards any of these countries as we have acted towards China in regard to the opium question, say, then shall we have need to fear them and to keep well armed in defence against them. A great responsibility rests upon the Western nations at the present time, for it largely depends upon how they act during the next two or three decades as to what the East will do



WILFRED WELLOCK

Copyright 1922
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PREFATORY NOTE

IT is a pleasure to me to commend the perusal of this book in India. The teaching of Ahimsa has been for many ages a part of the spiritual atmosphere which we breathe in India. It is no novel doctrine. We regard it as going back directly in its origin to the Buddhist and Jain developments in our history,—some five hundred years before the birth of Christ. We gladly recognise in Christ's teaching, in this respect, the spirit of India. On the plane of this higher spiritual message of the great teachers of humanity, East and West can meet; and it will indeed be a consummation devoutly to be wished, if the coming Age will carry out in practice this teaching of Ahimsa, and instil such a spirit in the younger, rising generation, both in East and West alike, that war may become at last morally impossible.

SHANTINIKETAN, }
1st June, 1922.

DWIJENDRANATH TAGORE.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

MR. WILFRED WELLOCK is a well-known writer of parts whose name must not be unfamiliar to India ; for, in pre-war days, he was a frequent contributor to our well-known periodicals. He has consecrated his life to secure the spiritual unity of all mankind, the bringing about of a universal citizenship founded on love and service, of the abolition of greed as a motive force between nations and between individuals, and, thus, of the total abolition of war.

Mr. Wellock's belief in the unity of human nature and in the desire of the great masses of mankind everywhere for peace, unity, co-operation and goodwill is so strong that he refused to fight in the Great War. For that refusal he was imprisoned for upwards of two years. He is now working harder than ever for universal brotherhood. He is on the Committee of the No More War International Movement and is looking forward to a time

which he believes is not far distant, when Britain will have far different rulers from what she has to-day, and when she will help to bring in a new era by the inauguration of a policy of freedom within the Empire, and a new universal commercial policy founded upon justice, the co-operative spirit and the recognition of the paramount value of fellowship between all mankind.

Mr. Wellock spends his time in writing and going about preaching the New World from village to village and from city to city. He is, in fact, one of those few, but far-sighted, Western friends who see in Satyagraha the future peace and happiness of the world and his writings therefore cannot but, be of great interest to India at the present time.

PREFACE

THE outstanding feature of the present time is the world-wide movement towards social emancipation. Not less significant or important, however, is the emergence of a belief that this end can only be attained by non-violent means. The conviction is taking root that violence involves disbelief in humanity, and must thus prevent the attainment of the ends desired. It is now being recognised that a good society can only come out of goodwill, that only love can establish the social regime whose law is love.

At last, faith in the old, brutal methods of trying to save mankind from oppression is fast disappearing. Since 1914, rivers of blood have been shed, and greater efforts have been made along the old, destructive lines, to win peace and freedom, than ever before. And yet there is less peace and less freedom in the world to-day than there was in 1914. Clearly the

method of violence has failed. Even some of the nations which appeared to have won political or economic freedom by means of the sword, now find themselves as much the victims of tyranny and intolerance as before.

We have frankly to confess, therefore, that the instrument of social emancipation, that is, of freeing mankind from a materialistic outlook, has yet to be forged. But there are indications that at last it is being forged. Love, and not hatred, goodwill and not violence, is the world's sole hope of salvation. In every part of the world there are people who now recognise this.

There had been a pacifist movement in Europe and in America before the Great War. Tolstoy had taught the principles of Non-resistance, and had won disciples in every part of the world. The War proved for these a testing time. Some succumbed, but many remained faithful. In Britain, 6,000 young men endured imprisonment rather than go forth to kill their fellows. The following pages are a slightly abridged reproduction of a little book which was written in 1916, partly to prove to my countrymen that the ends for which they were professedly fighting could not possibly be achieved by the means they were

adopting, and partly to support the faith of those who were suffering persecution for their pacifist convictions.

My faith in the method of Non-violence is greater to-day than ever, and it is a source of gratification to me to be a co-worker with others of like mind in India, where the movement for social emancipation has reached a spiritual altitude that is, I think, unique in in the world's history. Is it too much to hope that India will remain true to the principle she has embraced, and by it become truly free, transformed into a veritable democracy? India must not adopt the western methods that are proving so disastrous, but must recognise that the sword has failed to bring peace, contentment, and the conditions of a happy life to the people.

Thus I send forth this little book to you in India with a prayer of Godspeed in your great struggle. Our aims are one; our humanity is one. In love and by sacrifice let all the friends of peace and brotherhood everywhere work together, fearless of consequences, or of what others do and think, and soon—sooner than we dream—will be created that great republic of humanity of which prophets have spoken and poets sung, where all are free to

enjoy the fruits of the earth and of the spirit, and where none are masters but all are servants one of another.

Except that the title has been changed, that one whole chapter, and part of another have been omitted on the ground of irrelevency to other than European readers, and that in some cases the tense has been changed from the present to the past, the text appears exactly as it did when it was first published.

The Victory of Peace, three poems, originally published separately, have also been incorporated with the book in this edition.

NELSON
LANCASHIRE }
April 1922.

WILFRED' WELLOCK.

CONTENTS

PAGE

THE THEORY OF NON-VIOLENCE	...	I
THE METHOD OF WAR	...	14
WHY CHRIST WAS RIGHT	...	27
THE EVIDENCE OF HISTORY	...	43
HOW TO DEAL WITH MILITARISM	...	55
THE FUTURE	75
THE ONLY WAY	...	89
THE VICTORY OF PEACE: Three Poems		
An Uninvited Guest	...	107
Weep if your eyes have tears	...	110
War and Peace: A Dialogue	...	112

AHIMSA AND WORLD PEACE

OR

The Case for Non-violence

I

THE THEORY OF NON-VIOLENCE

IS violence preventable? Or is it inevitable, natural to man, of the very essence of human nature?

Whatever answer history or custom may suggest, or Established Authority give to these questions, I am convinced that the heart of mankind the world over speaks with clarion voice upon this matter, loathes the whole idea of sanguinary warfare, and would rejoice as never before could an assurance be given that

I

2 AHIMSA AND WORLD PEACE

violent methods of settling disputes were to be for ever abandoned.

And certainly of one thing we may be quite sure : if war cannot be abolished there is absolutely no hope for the future of the race, as sooner or later society is bound to annihilate itself.

In support of this contention let me cite one or two facts. By reason of the rapid growth of science and of commerce during the last few decades, the life-destroying power of the nations has enormously increased. Commerce has brought untold wealth, while science has made unspeakably deadly the implements and forces of destruction ; in consequence of which modern warfare is becoming increasingly ominous, while the power of the nations to continue in a state of war is practically unlimited. The probability is, therefore, that if war is not soon abolished, conflicts will arise in which entire nations and races will be completely blotted out of existence, and even vast continents be reduced to impotency and desolation.

One thing is certain, therefore : war must be abolished at all costs if civilisation is to survive ; the madness of violence must be recognised, its causes removed, its implements destroyed.

But how can this be done? It can be done by one means only: the manifestation of a better spirit. We are waiting for the leaders who are prepared to put their ideals and principles to the test, make a great spiritual adventure, launch out on the troubled sea of public opinion and trust the highest truth they know, their deepest instincts.

For whilst we of the Western world are in imminent danger of committing international suicide, we are nevertheless on the verge of a new social era, the era of reason and brotherhood; but we are afraid to step into it, to trust our finer intuitions. For years we have preached the unity of human nature and denounced the agencies which breed hatred between the peoples; have proclaimed the sufficiency of Christ's Gospel as an antidote for war and all evil, and openly declared that goodwill and co-operative effort are the only forces that can break down those irrational antagonisms which divide nation against nation and class against class. And yet, when the time comes for us to put our ideals to the test, to expose the greed of grasping commercialists and the madness of the militarists, we shrink from the ordeal, hide ourselves behind formulæ we had over and over again declared to be

worn out and worthless, and finally deny all that we had formerly believed and caused others to believe.

Spiritual kingdoms, no less than earthly, have to be discovered and won, literally torn from the hands of the enemy. Columbus discovered America by trusting a fragile bark and setting out on an unknown sea. And the kingdom we are seeking, the great brotherhood of mankind that we have so long been fighting for, will have to be won in the same way: by trusting what we no doubt often feel to be a fragile thing—an ideal, a principle—and launching out on a new line of conduct.

If any of us think that war is going to be abolished without a struggle, without taking tremendous risks, we are sublimely mistaken. Peace, "whose conquests are no less renowned than war," will never be finally secure until the faith on which it rests has come to grips with War: conquered it face to face.

All the chief European nations have for years been dominated by a small body of men who, for various reasons—many of which are startlingly sinister,—are avowed militarists, and unless we check the machinations of these minorities everything that we hold dear will be torn from our grasp: even our aspirations and hopes.

One plain fact that we must not lose sight of is that the common people of all the nations do not want war, but love peace; have no desire for what is not their own; and ask for nothing but what every man has a right to: reasonable opportunities of self-expression and self-development. The insatiable greed, the envy and jealousy, which are the root causes of all wars, are the possession of a small minority only, and such a minority exists in every nation; and is, could we but see truly, each nation's greatest, if not its sole, enemy.

The truth of this statement is borne out by the fact that during the ten years immediately preceding the recent war, the expenditure on armaments in all the belligerent countries rose by leaps and bounds, while yet the disbelief in war among the people grew equally rapidly. Such a fact ought to convince us that could but one nation summon the moral courage to refuse to go to war at the bidding of its militarist rulers, and declare its readiness to put its ideals to the test, it would be sure to succeed, would effect the rout of the militarists and banish war from the earth for ever. Only one such instance is needed in order to achieve this end, for the moment it is realised that goodwill and spiritual weapons are more powerful than

hatred and physical weapons, war will lose its grip and its glamour, and will pass away like an evil dream on the approach of morning.

What we fail to realise is that human nature is one, a unity; that all men are brothers; that obedience to the fundamental laws of life does and must lead to social unity and brotherhood, and that we shall never get beyond the fear and possibility of war until we realise that love is the profoundest force in the world, is irresistible, all-conquering. Indeed, the whole case for Ahimsa rests on the recognition that human nature is worthy of trust, and is not, as is commonly said, inherently selfish. Human nature is neither inherently selfish nor opposed to reason; it is against its highest interests to be such. Love must ultimately prevail because it is the condition of the richest and fullest life, and because it opens the heart to the best things, turns evil into goodness, anger into sweetness, enmity into friendship. All the deeper thrills of life come, as we all know when we think, from acts of self-sacrifice, conduct prompted by love, a desire to render best service. And love is the universal language: not a soul exists but understands it, values it, desires it, obeys it. As Christ, whose chief mission was to teach the supreme life-value of love, was

constantly emphasising, his underlying purpose was to increase life, to reveal to mankind the conditions of a more abundant life. All men are seeking fullness of life, but many fail to find it; yet they all know it—know it and desire to grasp it—when they see it. And this fact remains: that acts prompted by goodwill are universally recognised as the noblest achievements and monuments of man.

I am convinced that human nature is better than we are apt to think it is, and is ever responsive to the truly good and great. The greatest scamp on earth will render homage to the noble act. If we trust men, appeal to what is best in them, they will rise to the level of our esteem; whereas if we distrust them, suspect them of all manner of evil, we shall insult and degrade them, invite the same sort of treatment in return, and ultimately descend with them into the slime of hatred and revenge.

“Man must needs love the highest when he sees it!” and that is true whether he be an Englishman or an Indian. The motive behind all conduct is a desire for life, and every man possesses something of the primal essence of being, that upward-moving, aspiring force which has been operating in the world from life's first beginning. And life has but one

law; from which it follows that what leads to life must be followed by all men once it is recognised.

Herein lies the whole argument for Ahimsa and pacifism. The pacifist knows that there can be no change of character or of conduct but through a change of ideas, and also that reason and goodwill are the only agencies in a civilised age capable of effecting such changes. Moreover, goodwill never yet lost a battle, as it is not in human nature to do harm to those who obviously wish one well. Love can even conquer in the midst of the madness and fury of war, as the tales of soldiers testify.

It is commonly assumed that non-violence is a negative principle, that the pacifist is one who would stand idly by while an enemy took all his goods and killed all his relatives and friends, and who would even then oblige the tyrant by meekly becoming his slave. The direct opposite is the case. As a fact the pacifist is the last man in the world you could enslave, as he simply will not do what conflicts with his conscience. Indeed, it is because he will not endure slavery that he is resisting military service and that he is prepared to suffer any penalty rather than take part in a mode of warfare that he does not believe in.

The pacifist is as keen a fighter as the most ardent militarist; the chief difference between them is as to their methods. The pacifist resists evil quite as much as the militarist, but his resistance is intellectual, moral and spiritual, not physical. In other words, the pacifist simply refuses, as a rational being, to fight what are essentially moral and spiritual battles with physical weapons. Endowed with reason, sympathy, and imagination, the pacifist feels it to be beneath his dignity to throw all those powers to the winds and to fall back for the means of defending Truth and Right upon his merely physical powers. Recognising that he is a man, he refuses to fight as though he were only an animal. And why should man, who aspires to be like the gods, stoop to the methods of savages? Surely those qualities of mind and soul which are the product of civilisation, and which distinguish man from the brute creation, are of more value than those which he has in common with that creation! And how foolish, when one has the gift of reason and of love, to try and convince men of error by mercilessly mutilating their bodies!

What sight could be more disheartening, what practice more absurd, than that of young men of culture and refinement, carefully trained

and delicately nurtured, versed in the loftiest arts, capable of the most perfect reasoning, gentle, sympathetic, tolerant, suddenly discounting all these wonderful spiritual gifts—just because a few men in authority had had a quarrel which their hauteur prevented them from settling—and giving themselves up to a few months of battering at one another with merciless cannon—thousands upon thousands of them, the fairest products of civilisation, meeting their doom in ways more frightful than sheep in the shambles !

Pacifism is simply applied Christianity ; and what is the use of pretending to believe in Christianity if we will not trust it in a crisis ? If Religion fails in the hour of greatest need, of what value is it ? Is our faith only for sunny days, to be put on and off like a garment ? How can Religion ever have a chance when we fly to the sword the moment we are assailed ? Let us make no mistake : if our Religion is not the strongest thing about us it is useless. For when I speak of goodwill I do not mean the sentimental weakness of an untutored mind, but the deliberate policy of a strong soul, the soul that dare rely upon its convictions, its deeper instincts.

If war is ever to be abolished it will have to

be by means of a force that is stronger than physical force: and such force is goodwill. And love is amongst us, waiting to achieve what it was sent into the world to achieve, and we will not let it; we will not, dare not, trust it. Each time the crisis comes we falter, give heed to the voice of Tradition and Authority, the arch enemies of all progress, run with the fevered multitude and allow ourselves to become the victims of hate and fear. The fact is we dare not trust civilisation because we dare not trust ourselves, the truths and principles we profess. It is our own weakness that stands in the way, not the evil of others. At the very time when we had come to feel that war could be banished from our midst for ever, we allowed ourselves to participate in the most horrible display of physical force ever witnessed—and why? Because the faith we held sat but lightly upon us; because we, in fact, like all the other European nations were steeped in a materialism that was gnawing at our very vitals.

I hold that war in an age of civilisation such as ours is a confession of weakness, a sign that we either do not possess any strong convictions or have no faith in them. And that, if we look deep enough, is why we are all feeling humiliated by the war, ashamed of ourselves for being

participants in such wholesale butchery as is involved in war. We are instinctively conscious that violence is beneath us. We simply cannot realise that we are where we are, that with all our spiritual endowments we are resorting to the methods of savages. The situation will not bear thinking about; and, truth to say, the people are not thinking about it: they dare not, lest they should go mad.

And yet we *must* face the issue, must realise where we are and whither we are going. Our ostrich policy of burying our heads must be abandoned. The end is not yet; and unless we bestir ourselves and bring a different spirit to bear, the fury of battle may even yet carry the conflict to the last man. What we want is moral elevation, a stronger faith in truth, in our better selves, in human nature. With these we can conquer all things—war and all enmity and bitterness; without them we can do nothing.

The substitution of goodwill for hatred, of the method of love for the method of violence, is the greatest achievement man has yet been called upon to undertake: it is possibly the greatest he ever will be called upon to undertake. But attempt it he must—and succeed, or the end of civilisation is not far off. Civilisa-

tion cannot possibly make further advancement until the menace of war, with its concomitants—fear, distrust, enmity and hatred, and ever-growing armaments—has been removed from our midst. We are at the parting of the ways, and soon we must make the choice between the method of war and world extinction, or the method of trust and goodwill and a lovelier age than has ever been. By yielding to the call of the militarists, of the spiritually faithless ones, the faith of the nations in Christianity and in love is wavering; soon it may vanish altogether. We cannot trifle with vital principles with impunity. It is for us to say whether love and Christianity shall live or die; whether peace and goodwill or war and hatred shall triumph; whether the civilised world shall come to an untimely end, as it has so often done in the past, or man shall know himself for what he is, a spiritual being made in the image of God.

II

THE METHOD OF WAR

IN a civilised age war is the triumph of unreason, a spiritual catastrophe, an evidence of a moral collapse. This must be so for war is the absolute denial of civilisation, a confession that centuries of moral and spiritual development, of culture and religion are incapable of meeting all the demands which life makes upon us, are powerless in the teeth of physical force !

A civilised people suffering from war fever is the most lamentable condition conceivable, as it proves that, for the time being at any rate, Nature's finest achievements have been placed at a discount. By participating in war, civilised man debases himself, affirms what is not true, viz., that intellectual, moral, and spiritual forces are not stronger than physical and material forces.

These facts are confirmed by all our deeper instincts. Prior to the recent war the belief

that the civilised nations of the West had negotiated the last milestone in the rugged road of war, and that the complement of man's higher powers had become sufficient to guarantee the triumph of Right without the aid of war, was rapidly growing. Moreover, it was gradually being recognised that sheer might can establish nothing, that reason and not force is the final arbiter between right and wrong; and it is precisely because many are recognising these things that they are confidently saying that a one-sided peace cannot be a permanent peace; that the extravagant demands of a "successful" policy of revenge are bound, sooner or later, to prove disastrous to the victors. Modern history has taught us that the nation with Right on its side, which has also the moral courage to fight for it, on rational lines, must ultimately triumph. Of what avail, then, is violence? It is of no avail; it is an acknowledgment of moral timidity and spiritual impotency.

In semi-civilised ages, wherein reason is as yet undeveloped, valour is naturally the chief virtue. The man with the strongest arm and the truest eye is held to have a right to all that these can win in warfare. But with the growth of reason a new right is created, viz., moral

right, and because this is recognised as a higher right than that of physical force, the demand for it can never cease until it has been secured. As valour was the test of right in ancient times, so reason is the test of right in modern times ; and human nature being what it is, right must ultimately triumph or mankind perish. In ancient warfare, moreover, the warriors met in hand to hand encounter, whence it generally happened that the valorous man, the man with right on his side, won ; but where is the test of valour when men fight with guns, and mathematics, and "silver bullets," of which the least worthy nation, by reason of its selfishness and materialism, may possess the largest share ?

Why, then, being governed by a higher law, do we debase ourselves by stooping to a lower law, whose decisions, if they be not in accordance with justice, we cannot accept ? Is it not strange that we should lose faith in reason when it is manifestly reason that must ultimately prevail ? The nation that is morally strong enough to vindicate and ultimately to secure its rights, even though it has been defeated in a contest of physical force, was, if it could only have realised the fact, strong enough to have secured those rights without going to war.

If my contention be true, it follows that war in an advanced civilisation is an essentially destructive force. And such, I maintain, it can conclusively be shown to be.

It is impossible that war in a civilised age can be other than destructive when we realise that it is founded on disbelief in the humanity of one's enemies. The avowed object of every such war is a "permanent" peace; yet, obviously, there can be no permanent peace without reconciliation; and how can there be reconciliation when, fired by hatred, it is the sole aim of each belligerent to crush, subdue, and entirely incapacitate its opponent? A permanent peace can no more come out of war between civilised nations than light can come out of darkness; it is rank unreason to profess that it can. By attempting to kill a man you say in effect that you do not believe in his humanity, in the possibility of his salvation. It is sheer nonsense to say that you can kill a man out of love, as to kill him is to show an utter contempt for his personality. In other words, to kill a man is to deny the superiority of his higher over his lower nature; the validity of civilisation; the power of righteousness, of reason, of truth, of goodness, of love; the reality of progress, aspiration, and

States—the nation that a short while ago seemed about to lead the way to the era of perpetual peace—to “build the largest navy in the world,” can contemplate the future with equanimity, or feel they can bestow their benediction upon the war?

Think for a moment what the war has wrought, and then ask yourselves if reason can sanction it! Think, for instance, of the terrible and unimaginable loss of precious life, and of the unspeakable suffering and misery this has caused; of the incalculable loss of wealth, of art and beauty, of liberty; of the firm foothold that militarism has gained in this country; of the ascendancy of the military authorities in our administration; of the social and industrial chaos that it has resulted in; of the bitter hatred, the enmity and the fear, which are poisoning our very blood and threatening us with a serious deterioration of character; of the brutalising of our manhood through participation in the terrible and unthinkable butchery that went on; of the prejudice which springs from censored news, partial and one-sided reports of events—yes, think, and ask yourselves if war is the last word civilised nations can offer as a means of settling their disputes! or if a worse

state of affairs than the present could conceivably result from any method whatsoever ! and thus if it is not quite time another principle were tried !

Next to the poisoning of the peoples' blood with hatred and enmity, perhaps the worst evil of war is its brutalising effect upon those who are called upon to take part in it. And one has only to think of the circumstances of a soldier's life in a time of war to realise this. It being the avowed object of the soldier to kill, his entire life must necessarily be physical. Whilst he is training he must submit to be regarded as a superior kind of animal, whose chief business is to get himself fit to withstand hardship while endeavouring to kill as many human beings, among the "enemy," as he possibly can. Withdrawn from home and friends, from all the finer and softer influences of life, including the associations upon which his morals are to a very large extent dependent he is placed in an environment that is new and strange to him and foreign to his temperament. The manner and spirit of his new life, the habits and language of those about him, are unfamiliar, and in many respects repugnant to him, while the entire atmosphere of the life baffles and spiritually benumbs him. What

wonder, then, if his morals should give way a little, or if he should find it necessary to protect himself by hiding his finer feelings in the inner recesses of his soul—to be called out later, may be, should they be required.

But when such an one has had his first “taste of blood,” who can fathom his mind, describe his feelings? No one, for he cannot do that himself. For the time being he is a stranger to himself, a being he cannot identify, understand or control. His morals, his ideals—but then there are no morals, no ideals, after that; for he has killed a man!

It is thus that the mind is created which can commit atrocities—the mind that has been maddened by an act which, in spite of all that good and sincere patriots can say in its favour, is felt to be an outrage upon one’s own soul. Such a mind is no longer responsive to the normal standards of morality, and might, without a single qualm of conscience, do things unspeakable. Thus we shall always have atrocities so long as we have war. Atrocities are the revenge of Nature for the wrong that has been done her, for there is something in our nature which ever drives us towards consistency, even though it be in things evil. If civilisation demands that a man shall do

what his soul abhors, it must bear the consequences and accept such revenge as the act demanded compels.

And as it is with the moral law, so is it with man-made law : the two things, war and law, being absolutely contradictory. War is a law unto itself, and in the last analysis, knows no higher authority. International law has and can have no ultimate validity in a time of war, as each belligerent naturally thinks itself superior to its enemies, and thus that under no circumstances ought it to allow its enemies to survive in preference to itself. As our own Under-Secretary for War declared towards the beginning of the war, "Necessity knows no law"; from which it follows that during a war international law will be observed just so long as necessity does not demand that it be broken.

When the war broke out many preachers and teachers talked in heroics about the new era that would come after the war; when it had purified us, so to speak, of all our evil.

These are now silent. A new era has come after the war, it is true; but it is an era of sadness and sorrow; of turmoil, conflict, and contention; of vice, irreligion and immorality, of lamentation and regret. With all the waste

and wreckage, the misery and mourning, the hatred and enmity, the demoralisation caused by this war how can the golden age appear? Before such an age can be, a greater and more heroic conflict will have to be waged and won than that which is at present engaging us. Of the nature of that conflict I have endeavoured to convey some hint.

And surely those who in this war have cried for vengeance will soon have had their fill. If suffering contains the power of good, then indeed must Europe by now be purged of all her evil. But not all suffering worketh salvation; for vengeance, which is the cause of most suffering in war, is itself evil. The bad passion that the war has generated will not soon be eradicated from the nations' minds, but will bear a harvest of strife and wrong-doing that many will lament. Our blood has been poisoned, our spiritual constitution shaken. The thirst for vengeance is so widespread that it is difficult to protect one's soul from its venom. Nor is the Church a sanctuary against its attack. In many of our churches, indeed, the blood-thirsty atmosphere is beyond language to describe, so strong that it makes one almost afraid to enter a church; and it will be remembered by many with anguish and shame when

everything else connected with the war has been forgotten. God is being transformed into a tribal Deity and His abode into an establishment for generating hate. Could greater evil befall us?

I contend that it is not natural for civilised man to kill his fellows. Something in our hearts tells us that we are capable of better things than bloody warfare, and every healthy instinct cries out against such a practice. We cannot even listen to the birds singing in the trees, watch the buds burst forth on a thousand twigs in the rejuvenating days of Spring, or walk through smiling summer fields without feeling that life is sacred, that it is unnatural for cultured human beings to meet together in vast crowds, bringing with them all the devices of destruction that an insatiable greed or a panic-stricken, fear-beridden mind has created, and in a few short hours to destroy the rich fruits of time's hard struggling, blow the finely-wrought frames of a million men into tiny fragments of flesh, quench the holy fire of youth, hurl from the world unused the choicest gifts of Nature, and convert the beautiful handiwork of God and man into black desolation, fouling the fair face of the earth with a million marks of malice.

III

WHY CHRIST WAS RIGHT

WHEN Christ placed Himself in the hands of His persecutors after the battle with His conscience in Gethsemane, and refused to defend Himself or to permit others to defend Him, both then, and afterwards in the Trial Chamber, neither pleading for His life nor shrinking from its demands, and with scarce a murmur succumbing to His fate and dying with unparalleled dignity on the Cross, He proved Himself to be either the biggest fool on earth or the finest embodiment of human nobleness and greatness that had yet made its appearance.

When Christ said to the men who brought unto Him the woman taken in adultery: "He that is without sin among you let him cast a stone at her," thereby defying the Law and the Church, He was either speaking as a reckless anarchist or as a profound teacher who saw deeper into the heart of things than other men.

When Christ said to the people: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. . . . Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and do good to them that hate you . . ." He was defying the entire edifice of established opinion—Tradition, Custom, and, as it appeared, the whole trend of history, all the extant moral and civil codes—and was either giving utterance to rank nonsense, like a moral renegade or a mountebank, or to words of profoundest wisdom, revealing thereby a new truth, the road to a richer and fuller existence, like a prophet.

And the question we have to decide is which of these two alternatives is the right one; for there cannot be a third alternative, as Christ either spoke the truth or He did not; either acted heroically or He did not; either possessed a true conception of human nature or He did not. The question, moreover, is a vital one, one of the most vital questions that confront the present age; for upon the answer to it

depends to a very large extent the course of future history. If we decide in favour of the first alternative, the attitude of the Church with respect to the recent war stands condemned, and will have to be modified; while, if we decide in favour of the second, Christianity, as that has been interpreted by all the best teachers—as a spiritual religion, an embodiment of lofty moral and spiritual idealism, that is to say—will have to be abandoned, the noblest portions of the Gospel expunged from the New Testament, and Christ dethroned from the high altar on which the ages have placed Him and hurled to the dust as an arch-impostor. For seeing that the Gospel has been, and still is—at any rate, nominally—regarded as the authentic source of the Christian religion, it is of paramount importance that we inquire, at this time, into the validity and practicability of its teaching; at any rate, that part of it which appertains to war.

Such critics as Christianity has had throughout the ages have belonged to the ranks of Unbelievers. But to-day the situation is changed, as they are now to be found in the ranks of the Believers; for the Church itself has entered the lists against its Founder. As was the case when Christ was upon earth, so is it the case

to-day: His greatest enemies are to be found in His own camp, amongst the adherents of the orthodox Church. Once again we are witnessing the repudiation of Christ by the men who occupy the chief seats in the Church, and who ought to be, as the Scribes and Pharisees in Christ's day ought to have been, Christ's chief supporters.

To these critics I should like to put a simple question. If Christ is indeed the Saviour of the world, it must surely be by virtue of some truth that He taught; and if that truth is not contained in the Sermon on the Mount and in all that Christ taught concerning love, what is it, and where is it to be found? If Christ's teaching on the subject of non-resistance, of suffering for righteousness' sake, is not valid, is not in accordance with human nature, let the Church say so openly, and declare to the world her position. For it were far better to have a narrow, mutilated Christianity that people really believed in than a pompous Christianity intended only to be winked at or regarded as so much window-dressing. And after the appalling catastrophe of the present conflict, the sanctioning by the ministers of religion, and the churches generally, of the bloodiest war in history, we demand

to know on what grounds the Church rejects the teaching of Christ with respect to war.

As to what that teaching actually is, there can, I think, be no serious doubt; the only question that can possibly arise is as to its practicability. And the arguments which go to prove that Christ's teaching with respect to non-resistance is practicable, is in accordance with the deepest laws of human nature, are unassailable.

Why, in fact, do we say that Christ's name is above every other name? It is undoubtedly because of His lofty idealism, and of His heroic effort to give that idealism expression, to embody it in conduct. And shrink from accepting or adopting that idealism as we may, we implicitly acknowledge its truth, its validity, and its grandeur when we reverence its Author and Vindicator. The reason that all the ages have bowed to Christ, done Him reverence, acknowledged the sublime grandeur of His character, is that His life appealed to something deep and strong in human nature, and compelled men to accept as truth what reason was powerless to demonstrate. But it is not until truth can be demonstrated, can be shown to be a veritable principle of life, that it can be relied upon, put into practice with confidence,

especially in a crisis. That is why the Church is to-day failing to put the principle of non-resistance to the test: she feels vaguely that it is true, valid, but she can't be quite certain. And it is precisely because pacifists realise that our knowledge of human nature, of history, of psychology, of life is such that the validity and practicability of the principle of non-resistance can now be demonstrated, that they are pleading for its acceptance and demanding the abandonment of the vicious and played-out method of physical force.

It is not for nought that the human heart, all through the ages, has sanctioned and extolled the life of Christ. As the facts go to show, Christ was right. Christ's life was a proved life, the principles upon which it rested being justified by the result. By throwing Himself wholly upon the mercy of His enemies Christ secured a complete triumph over those enemies, a triumph for the truth He preached, and brought upon His assailants, who, by the way, achieved a physical triumph, the condemnation of the whole world. By refusing to resist evil physically Christ lost His life but saved His soul—and the Truth; turned what appeared to be an ignominious defeat into a matchless victory, and proved once for all that

physical force is no match for spiritual force, and that the latter must prevail if it be given a chance. Christ's death on the Cross was a great spiritual triumph ; for it heralded a new social law, vindicated a principle that must sooner or later bring about the overthrow of violence, and revealed to the world new and hitherto unsuspected forces of the human soul. Christ's death on the Cross was not, as it seemed, a mere negative fact, but a profound, spiritual affirmation, which not only condemned, confounded, and utterly routed His enemies, and left His followers complete masters of the situation, but stirred the imagination of the time, as it has done of every age since. The victory of the Cross was a victory for the idealism which led to it ; and, what is of paramount importance, it was a victory over ordinary, every-day, and, as many would say, depraved human nature. Christ did not preach truth for the future merely, to be applied two or three thousand years hence, but truth that was capable of being successfully applied where-soever and by whomsoever it was believed.

Now, why, let me ask, did the Cross succeed ? Why, that is to say, did Christ's ignominious death accomplish what His life had failed to accomplish ? It was because human nature

is finer than people think it ; because, as a fact, it is the everlasting law of the human heart to respond to what is truly noble, truly great and good. And if this is so, it proves that the sole reason why Christianity fails is that we have not faith in it, are not cognisant of the fundamental laws of human nature which Christianity assumes, and upon which it rests.

The case for militarism rests on an unsound psychology, on a total misconception of human nature. The strongest factor in human nature, as I have before maintained, is aspiration, the longing for life ; in consequence of which everything that is truly heroic and carries one above the commonplaces of life, all that is sordid and materialistic, inspires and thrills and wins the admiration of all. Society does very often fall to a sordid level, it is true ; but that is because there are no heroes, no idealists, to lift it higher, to show it a better way. As the Hebrew prophet said, a city may be saved if but ten men be left who have not bowed the knee to false gods.

I know it is the custom to sneer at Democracy, at the aims and ideals of the common people. But what can you expect when there is no one to lead them to something better, when selfishness and materialism rule in high

places? The rank and file of the people must always be more or less dependent upon the supposed thinking classes for guidance; but if the latter do *not* think, or think carelessly, and act as other men, what can be expected of the democracy? Personally, I have great faith in the democracy, and believe that the people are ever responsive to idealism that is clearly and sincerely expressed.

This basic fact is the secret underlying the Cross, Christ's advocacy of the principle of non-resistance. Just as Christ knew that physical force, if left to itself, would defeat its own ends, so He knew that the manifestation of true heroism, of faith and trust in truth and in human nature, would free the truth, cause it to stand out in all its nobleness and grandeur, and at least compel men to honour the faith and the courage that dare vindicate it. *Nothing is so powerful as truth and goodness*, the courage whereby a man will throw himself on the honour of his enemies, and trust, as Christ trusted, the faithless sons of a materialistic age and even die at their hands. That is the meaning of non-resistance: it succeeded in Jerusalem nineteen centuries ago; and would succeed to-day as well.

By refusing to resort to physical force we

disarm our enemies, or at any rate make it so that they cannot succeed, as the more evil they did as the result of our trusting in them, the more would they lose the sympathy of the world at large. To adopt non-resistance is really to appeal to the heart of mankind the world over, to fling oneself on the suffrage of the world. It is thus to free and increase moral and spiritual force. Whereas, we know, to resort to physical force is to deny and cast out reason ; to institute the censorship to the stifling and distorting of the truth ; and thus to cause the moral issue to recede farther and farther into the background. And under such conditions, how can truth or right prevail, or how can it be expected that the result, whatever that be, can be accepted by the defeated party ? In face of the wrong to which hatred and the letting loose of wild passion—the inevitable offspring of war—always give rise, how can war conceivably end war, accomplish reconciliation ? War is the sign and proof of man's disbelief in his fellow man, in human nature ; whereas reconciliation is the outcome of man's belief in his fellow man. How then can an open manifestation of disbelief lead to belief ?

By refusing to fight physically, but trusting

reason and truth, the human nature of your enemy, you discredit and humiliate your enemy, put him on his honour, and thus compel him, sooner or later, to do what is right and honourable; you also bring the judgment of the world on to your side, unite all the forces of righteousness in every country on your behalf, and thus erect an impassable barrier of public opinion. Your enemy, from momentary anger, might strike a few blows, burn a few houses, or kill a few people; but that would be all, and it would be an ineradicable stain upon his name, for your open and honest dealing would have given the lie to the faithless and pernicious cliques which, while they bring about wars, yet proclaim, when the crisis comes, that they are the aggrieved party, and that their nation is fighting a war of self-defence.

Now the reason that lies are possible, and are effective, is because of fear. Fear is the great nourisher of war, a demon that, at all costs, must be cast out of the nations. Hating war and desiring peace, each nation, by reason of the fear which its policy of large armaments helps to keep alive, is led to believe in the evil intentions of its neighbours, and thus to spend still larger sums on armies and armaments, the sinister objects of which are never disclosed.

And nothing in the world can destroy fear except trust. To say that you are going to defeat militarism in one country by means of a greater militarism in another country, is an insult to the intelligence, sheer madness. The nation that uses physical force to destroy physical force, must believe in such force, and by reason of the disaster, suffering, and hatred which war always causes, that belief must needs persist when there is no war; while the maintenance of a large army in one country is bound to constitute a menace and a challenge to other countries, and to cause these to do all in their power to outclass their neighbours. While, as for one nation claiming the right to safeguard the peace of the world by virtue of its just and righteous aspirations and intentions, it so happens that no nation can produce a record sufficient to justify such a claim.

The manifestation of a better spirit is the only thing that can save us; and that *would* save us, because it would prove to the world that the fear, hatred, distrust, and suspicion that are the soul of war and the direct cause of large armaments are neither natural nor inevitable, but are spiritual excrescences that would naturally die were it not for the machinery which produced them artificially. We

are simply waiting for the nation that has the moral courage to make an adventure of a quite new kind, the courage to trust and appeal to the best instead of the worst in human nature. By that means alone can we hope to allay the fear, destroy the hatred, and expose the greed and the perfidy which, together, are the source of modern wars. What militarist clique, however sinister its motives, could or would attempt to hold its position confronted by a nation which, on high moral grounds, refused to fight, but placed its card on the table and appealed to the conscience of the world? Surely it must be obvious to every thinking man that by means of a policy of distrust, the policy of the mailed fist, of fear and hatred, we are playing into the hands of the militarists, stimulating fear all round, and making the last condition worse than the first! With such passion as exists to-day a "successful" war will be just the war that will not be successful, will not accomplish the end for which it is ostensibly being waged. Indeed the time has come when we must either break once and for all, or strengthen beyond all knowledge, the throttling ring of armaments that like a ravenous snake tightening its hold upon its victim, is squeezing the life out of all the great

nations, robbing them of their freedom, their joy, their love, their tender graces, and their spiritual ardour, poisoning and dwarfing the soul of every man, and child within them.

There are thus two ways by which we may try to destroy militarism, a false way and a true way; a way that is suicidal, that works in opposition to human nature, to all the known laws of the heart and mind, and thus cannot in the very nature of the circumstances ever hope to succeed, and a way that is constructive throughout, that compels, by the sheer magnificence of moral daring and trust in human nature, the best that is in human nature to come out, and not in the belligerent nations only, but the world over, wherever the act is recorded. And in the public opinion of the entire civilised world there is ample support for any cause.

The first method is that of meeting evil with evil, nay worse, it is that of trying to destroy an evil by a larger dose of the same evil; which is like trying to cure a fever by multiplying the fever germs. Recognising the menace of increasing armaments in their neighbours, those who adopt this method do not seem to realise that by overcoming those neighbours by means of a superior militarism they, in turn, are becom-

ing a greater menace, and a new source of fear, to those neighbours. Nor do they try to explain the psychological process whereby a nation that has just beaten its neighbour in a clash of arms, *thus proving its belief in militarism*, is going to be in any wise willing to lay down its own arms afterwards. The belief in militarism that has led to the taking up of arms will, if victory be secured, compel the retention of those arms. And so the practice will go on *ad infinitum*—or rather, until the nations' strength is consumed in devising and fashioning the means of destruction, and all the peoples perish together in a great last war.

The other method is symbolised in the Cross; for the Cross of Christ stands for a profound spiritual principle of which the Church of Christ in this twentieth century has proved itself to be in complete ignorance. Of that principle I have tried to give some indication. That it is bound to work is proved by what we may all see every day of our lives in a thousand directions. Who does not daily, in quiet ways and places, see the transforming power of virtue and goodness? Who has not seen the man of filthy tongue change his manner immediately upon coming into the presence of certain people? Such an one is, almost

without knowing it, paying his respects to goodness by imitating it. And that is the human nature with which you and I come into touch every day. For every day the observing eye may witness anger turned to amity, wrath to reason, fury to friendliness, terrorising to tenderness, revenge to reverence—and all by the same simple, and often unconscious, method—that of manifesting a better spirit, good for evil.

And that same method the nations will have to adopt before war can be ended; there is no other way. Then why not adopt it now? *Was not Christ right?*

IV

THE EVIDENCE OF HISTORY

CUSTOMS, traditions, as we all know, die hard; especially those which have wrought a great work, helped to make a people's spirit mould its character, establish its being and shape its destiny. Yet they must all die sooner or later, for life is essentially progressive; and the customs that are the condition of life in one age may be the condition of decay and death in a later age. Customs are to the spirit what clothing is to the body; and mankind wears out and outgrows the former just as it does the latter. Thus vital and important as the past is, it is not nearly so vital and important as the future; for the future belongs to the mind, the living mind of the present, being capable of taking upon itself quite new forms, of embodying finer ideals and relationships. Indeed, that is the whole fascination of life: that it is amenable to mind, capable of an

infinite variety of manifestations. A reverence for tradition is laudable; but a reverence for ideals is indispensable. Ideals are the embryo of the future; and "where there is no vision the people perish." A man's ideals are always the truest and the strongest things about him, for they tell us not simply what he has been, but what he hopes to be; which is far more important. A man is always more than his past.

Ideals make history, a new story: they destroy old traditions but make new ones possible. Properly understood a tradition is a testimony to an ideal, an ideal that has done its work; for which reason those who uphold tradition ought at least to show some respect for new ideals.

And a new ideal is struggling for recognition in our own time: the ideal of universal brotherhood, with its implied basic principle, non-resistance. But custom and tradition are against it, many so-called leaders of society and upholders of enlightenment being, by reason of an undue reverence for tradition and the Powers-that-be, the chief hindrances to its progress. For the people, observing the lack of faith in men in high places, distrust their better judgment, and thus unwittingly help to strengthen the forces of reaction.

There are many things that to one age seem right that later ages declare to be wholly wrong. We might mention, for instance, cannibalism, duelling, hanging for such offences as sheep stealing, etc. Moral perception, like natural perception, develops, gives rise to finer social relationships, and thus to better manners and morals; necessarily so, for progress is the nature of life. And it is a simple and irrefutable fact that as the human spirit grows in beauty and power, the folly and futility of war become more and more apparent, notwithstanding that change, difference of opinion, clash and conflict will never be eliminated from human society: For clash of interests and difference of opinion are no more an argument for the perpetuation of physical warfare than being periodically hungry is an argument for the perpetuation of cannibalism.

But the question naturally arises, at what stage in the development of society ought the principle of non-resistance, under a threat of war, to be substituted for the method of physical force? To my mind, the answer is clear and conclusive: it is when the conviction takes root that war is wrong, is the negation of civilisation senseless and suicidal, and wholly incapable of overthrowing social evil or vindicating

any moral or spiritual principle. For let me emphasise this paramount fact, that the success or practicability of non-resistance does not depend upon the moral condition of the people towards whom it is manifested, but essentially upon the moral condition, the faith and the courage of those who profess to believe in it. A savage, for instance, might not conceive the idea of non-resistance; but he would be amenable to its operation. It would reveal to him a new quality in human nature, and, being manifested by men whom natural superiority and civilisation had led him to respect, if not, indeed, to reverence, would cause him to marvel, and compel him to act in a similar manner. And there is abundant proof that such would be the case. We have it, for instance, in the conquests of missionaries like Livingstone and Moffat, the mere mention of whose names was for long years a passport into the regions where they had laboured. We have it, too, in the splendid record of the Quakers of Pennsylvania in their relationships with the Red Indian tribes who lived in contiguity with them. William Penn was not long in establishing friendly communication with these Indian tribes, and eventually he made a treaty with them; of which treaty, Voltaire

said that it was the only one ever made without an oath, and the only one never broken. On this occasion William Penn told the natives that he and his people never fired a rifle or used a sword; that they meant no harm and had no fears. In the treaty of friendship itself, it was declared that the Red Men and the White Men should all be brothers; that all the paths should be free; the doors of the White Man open to the Red Man; the lodges of the Red Man open to the White Man; that neither side should believe evil reports of the other, but should go and see for themselves, and then "bury such false reports in a pit which had no bottom." In case any harm was done the matter was to be reported, and justice declared by twelve honest men. When Penn had read the treaty he laid the scroll on the ground, and the Great Chief replied to the effect that they would live in peace with Penn and his children "while sun and moon and stars endured." And it is on record that the security and peace of the country was enjoyed for more than seventy years, "without even a militia for defence, in the midst of six great Indian tribes." And peace was not destroyed until the Legislature, supposing there was greater security in the sword than

in Christianity, voted in favour of a militia. From that hour Pennsylvania became subject to war.

Consequently the people who say they would be prepared to put non-resistance into operation were their enemies to do likewise, miss the entire point; for in that case there would be no need for non-resistance. *Non-resistance is a principle for overcoming evil*; but if there be no evil, no recalcitrant element in society, there can be no need for non-resistance. The teaching of Christianity is that human nature being what it is, ever responsive to true courage, to real nobility of spirit and character, the principle of non-resistance is invincible.

But why, it will be asked, during nineteen centuries of Christianity, has no nation seen fit to adopt non-resistance as a working principle? The answer is simple: it is because the nations of Europe have not, until quite recent times, realised the meaning of non-resistance. A very high level of civilisation is necessary in order to discover and appreciate the meaning and possibility of non-resistance. What we are perhaps too apt to forget is that Christianity was the topstone of a great civilisation, the culmination of a long line of development; and it was not to be expected that the semi-barbaric

Teutons who' over-ran Europe in the early centuries of the Christian era could understand and assimilate the highly ethical and spiritual teaching of Christ. As a fact, the finest teaching of the New Testament never has been understood by Europe; and it is only in these latter days that the inner meaning of Christianity has begun to be grasped by the people as a whole—although, and be it said to their honour, the Quakers got a real glimpse of it some 250 years ago. Hitherto Christianity has not consisted of Christ's basic ethical and spiritual principles, which is what Christianity really is, but of Pauline theology, Church tradition, ritual, creeds, 'etc. All through the ages Christ has been portrayed as a Divine mystery rather than as a teacher; as a mystic being, by merely believing in and worshipping whom—with the aid of an elaborate theology, or a still more elaborate symbolism—one could be saved, rather than as a prophet who came to teach men how to *live*, how to realise life through conduct.

Moreover, we have only to picture the mind of the Middle Ages to realise how incapable that mind must have been of conceiving, not to speak of adopting, such a highly spiritual principle as non-resistance. In an age in

which knowledge was of the scantiest; in which there was little art and no science; in which the few morals that prevailed were crude, fixed, and under the absolute control of the Church, and in which personality had scarcely begun to be recognised, valued for its own sake, owing to the physical nature of life at that time, in such an age, I say, how could profound spiritual laws be conceived? As yet reason had scarcely been born. The very idea of discussing morals was quite out of the question, it being considered sacrilegious to discuss natural not to speak of moral questions. To formulate a new natural theory was to incur the displeasure of the Church. But the simple fact that art was in its infancy proves conclusively that spiritual life was only just beginning to manifest itself, to be self-conscious. The Middle Ages were essentially dark ages. The soul of the Teuton had as yet scarcely come to birth; indeed it was the function of the monastery, with its safety, its seclusion, and its mystic appeal, to wean the people from a crude bodily existence to a quite new idea and way of life, the life of the spirit. Naturally the people were illiterate; for there was no printing press and few books; only the few were cultured, while most of the culture was

imported. Thus, with their crude ideas and cruder morals, and a mystic religion whose object was to arrest their slowly awakening mind by inspiring it with awe, a sense of the avenging power of God; which taught that human nature was wholly sinful and depraved, how could our Teutonic forefathers be expected to grasp the significance of non-resistance, the inner meaning of Christ's death on the Cross?

But with the growth of art and the birth of science a new era was foreshadowed. Owing to a deepening insight into the meaning of life, and thus into the purpose of morals; to the growth of the power of self-expression, and thus of the spirit itself; to the cultivation of personality and the gradual recognition that man is a spiritual being, worthy of love and capable of infinite development; and later, to travel, trade, interchange of ideas, etc., the conviction has taken root that human nature is one, that the heart of mankind the world over thirsts for and responds to the same things, and that the fundamental principles of life are co-operation, mutual aid and helpfulness, etc. And this conviction has made a new era possible, revealed the glorious possibility of a world without war and bloodshed. Thus, through the growth of reason, the culture of the

heart and the spirit, and as the outcome of a truer and fuller grasp of the laws of the human mind, of the essence and purpose of human nature, the meaning and practicability of non-resistance, and thus of Christianity, have finally been realised.

And having at last reached this high altitude of spiritual attainment, we are able to see that the Christianity which has been in vogue in Europe for something like fifteen hundred years is very different, both in form and spirit, from the Christianity which Christ taught. In fact, I firmly believe, as I have maintained elsewhere in a quite different connection, that the nations of Western Europe are to-day pretty much in the same stage of development as were the Jews at the time of Christ, are, indeed, just preparing to enter upon what might be called the spiritual era—using the term spiritual in its widest sense—the era of democracy, of brotherhood, of universal fellowship in which there is neither war nor rumours of war.

A similar development may also be observed in the history of the Jews. We are all familiar with the warlike tendencies of the Israelitish tribes in their early history, till long after they had become consolidated into a single nation. We are also familiar with the

kind of Deity they worshipped: Jehovah, the God of Battles. But what a change takes place as their spiritual nature grows, and they begin to live in the spirit, and to think less of the body and things carnal! The rewards of God for obedience to His laws are no longer physical and material, but spiritual. The God of Battles dies, and in his stead comes One who delights not in battle, nor even in bloody sacrifices, but in a humble heart and a contrite spirit; for He is a God of mercy, tender and gracious. Thus we approach the time when one could cry: "Scatter Thou the people that delight in war," and when the people could look forward to the time "when the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains

. . . and all the nations shall flow into it"; when "the people shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." This spiritual development reaches its climax in Christianity; wherein is formulated, for the first time, a definite pacifist principle and policy.

To take war for granted, therefore, in an advanced age like the present is to commit a crime against civilisation, to ignore the entire trend of history, the ever-growing manifestation and

demands of the spiritual. For once the beauty and sacredness of human personality have been recognised, the laws and conditions of human well-being discovered, war becomes evil and inhuman and a sign of retrogression. So that while to the semi-barbarian, with his scarcely-awakened soul, war is a means of ennoblement, an upward-moving, civilising force, to the man of culture, who has other and ampler powers for vindicating right, other means of manifesting courage, it is a demoralising and decivilising force.

Many reformers are saying that the great need of our time is education ; but I cannot agree. The great body of the peoples, both of this and the other chief European countries, loathe the thought of war, know in their hearts that it is unworthy of them, that they are capable of a better way. What the age lacks is the moral courage to act up to its convictions. The world is waiting for a demonstration of Christian principles, a practical example of the Christian method ; and nothing else can save us. We have talked long enough ; *the time has come for action* ; and if we do not act before long the faith of the people in Christianity and in righteousness will have vanished, and darkness and ruin have spread themselves all over the earth.

HOW TO DEAL WITH MILITARISM

NOW I shall describe how I believe a nation which professes pacifism ought to meet an attack upon itself by a supposed bellicose enemy, or, to be precise, how Britain ought in *this twentieth century to meet a German invasion*. I deem it necessary, to clear away a few prejudices with respect to Germany, to inquire who and what Germany really is, and how she compares from the standpoint of militarism with Britain. Not that the result of such inquiry, whatever that be, would make any difference to my belief as to our duty in the situation named, but simply that, with the present state of mind and feeling in this country, it would be almost useless to suggest any policy which entailed a humane treatment of the Germans.

Now numerous as Germany's sins are—and undoubtedly her guilt is great—both in regard

to her militarist policy during recent years and to her conduct in this war, I cannot accept the view, so prevalent in this country, that out of Germany no good can come, while nothing that is evil can be laid at the door of Britain. Remembering the history of my own country during the last two or three decades, the alarming growth of materialism that has taken place, one feels compelled to hesitate before apportioning the blame for the present catastrophe. And it is our paramount duty to face the facts, for truth is the first condition of improvement.

War, or the passion which it excites, and which seems to be necessary to compel civilised and cultured human beings to kill their fellows, is in itself sufficient to create a prejudiced outlook; but war, aided by a rigorous press censorship, whose deliberate object is to create a definite and one-sided view of one's selves as well as of one's enemies, to read into every event, in which the enemy is involved a sinister motive and into every event in which one's own nation is involved a good motive, makes it exceedingly difficult for a true view to be had.

At the present time, it is quite necessary to obtain a true view of Germany's mind, the

mind of the great body of the German people as to the cause and meaning of the war and the part we and the other nations are playing in it. And such considerations are of vital importance, for if it should be that the German people have been deceived as to the cause and meaning of the war, such a fact would undoubtedly modify our attitude towards them.

The current British war-made view of Germany is that for forty years Germany has been planning and plotting for world power, has thought militarism, and practised militarism with the deliberate object of becoming the military dictator of Europe, if not of the world, and of monopolising the world's markets. She is charged with adopting a policy of "sword-rattling" which has been chiefly, if not solely, responsible for the stupendous growth of armaments during recent years.

But what, let us ask, is the German war-made view of Britain? It is that Britain, having been fortunate in obtaining all her colonies before she met with a serious rival, and having secured the majority of the world's markets, while yet being prepared to adopt ruthless methods to procure new ones, is jealous of any Power who comes forward to compete for those markets, and quite incensed

if it should assume naval and military responsibilities commensurate with its standing and interests, being in fact, ever ready to seize hold of any pretext in order to deal such Power a blow.

Now concerning the latter view we know that it is not a true one; at any rate we know that it does not reflect the mind of the great body of the nation. But does the former view reflect the mind of the German nation? And in regard to the latter view can we say that it does not represent the mind of a small minority of the British nation: a certain section of the Press, a number of militarists and Imperialists, and a not inconsiderable group of aggressive financiers and commercialists?

Can we say that our record is above suspicion? We British have been great colonisers, it is true, but we must confess that in all but a few minor and isolated instances our chief object in taking possession of backward countries has not been to colonise so much as to capitalise those countries; to tap new sources of raw minerals, to find new opportunities for capital, to start new industries and obtain new markets. Was that not our object in taking India, the greatest of our conquests? And why did we so recently interfere in Egypt?

Was it not primarily to protect the financial interests of British investors ?

Then, in regard to the liberty of the small nations, we have a delicate problem to face with respect to Persia, as the misgivings of many of our most respected politicians concerning our conduct there testify. Happily we made amends for our deplorable war in South Africa by a generous and noble-minded gift of Home Rule ; but ever since then there has been the Moroccan bargain, while the problem of Ireland is still with us. Nor is that all. As recently as February last, Sir Arthur Evans, one of the greatest authorities on the Balkan question, in an article in the *Manchester Guardian*, revealed facts which constitute a damaging commentary on the alleged reasons for our entering this war. Speaking of "the secret pact concluded between the Allies and Italy," which, as the price of Italy's co-operation, with strictly "limited liability," assured to her extensive tracts "inhabited by a compact Slav population—and including, indeed, some of the principal centres of South Slav nationalism !" Sir Arthur said : "This secret transaction, to which Sir Edward Grey gave his signature, was a flagrant contradiction to the repeated pledges given by the Prime Minister and others

on behalf of the Government that we were fighting 'for rights of the smaller nationalities' and "for the charter of their independence.' "

And touching this question of our object in the present war, what was the attitude of our Press soon after the war broke out? Did it not clamour for the German colonies and German trade? For weeks our newspapers contained little else but articles and advice on how to capture German trade. And this, together with the repeated attempts to foist a Protectionist policy on this country, and assisted by statements like that of Mr. Runciman's, afterwards modified, to the effect that economically Germany must not again be allowed to raise her head, have gone far to support the view that we were, after all, fighting a commercial war.

As to the growth of militarism during the last three or four decades, while agreeing that Germany has been the most aggressive of the nations of Europe, I cannot allow that she has been the sole or even the chief cause of that growth. Personally I am inclined to the view that commercial rivalry has been chiefly responsible for it, although I admit that there have been other causes. A passage in a book by John W. Graham, M.A., entitled "Evolution and Empire," admirably expresses my view

upon this point. Speaking with reference to Germany and Britain, he says : " We have not a single conflicting interest in the domain of high politics. It is such things as the Bagdad Railway, railways in China, mining concessions in Morocco, the right to buy or otherwise take badly owned or weakly owned lands in Africa, to acquire (say) Mozambique or Angola, if Portugal can be bought or pushed out. There is nothing but commercial rivalry between us."

Among the secondary causes of international rivalry in armaments should be mentioned the plottings of the armament makers. And we surely have not forgotten the periodical war-scapes of the last twenty years, and particularly the one that was engineered by Mr. Mulliner, whose conduct was exposed in the House of Commons and in a series of articles in the *Daily News*, etc., etc.

Also it is necessary to observe that previous to the last fifteen or twenty years our chief naval rivals were France and Russia. It was in the 'nineties that Germany, egged on by her armament makers, began to pay serious attention to her sea power. But even then she was but accepting our own doctrine that a large navy is essential to protect large shipping interests ; and, as a fact, Germany practically

doubled her exports during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Until 1880 Britain held a monopoly of the world's markets, a fact which surely throws much light on subsequent events. But while I do not think we ought to blame Germany for accepting our doctrines and building a large navy, neither do I think we ought to blame Britain for building in advance of Germany—that is, so long as they both believe in physical force as the final means of determining right.

Undoubtedly, during the last forty years, Germany has cultivated the military spirit to a far greater extent than has Britain; but then her empire is younger than ours, and was, as compared with ours, inadequately defended forty years ago; while again she lies in contiguity with an incalculable Russia. Nor ought it to be forgotten that the German people, as a people, abhor that spirit, and have for long been writhing under its sway. We are told otherwise to-day, of course, but war-made views of enemy peoples are the last things in the world to be relied upon. How can all the things that are being said about German militarism, the bellicose ambitions of the German people, be true, if we had known nothing of them previously? You cannot hide

the doings of an entire nation. As for Germany teaching militarism in her schools, such allegation has not been proved, although it is very likely that the rudiments of soldiership were taught in the higher schools. But then have not the majority of our Public Schools their Cadet Corps, and is not Britain well nigh overrun with Boys' Brigades? Also, until unmistakable evidence has been adduced I shall continue to believe that when the war started the common people of Germany were as familiar with the writings of Bernhardt as were the British public with those of Professor Cramb. And if German bellicosity as "Deutschland Uber Alles," have we not for a much longer period sung "Britannia Rules the Waves"?

But the case for a bellicose German people collapses entirely when we remember how insistently the Kaiser, his Chancellor, and the entire German Press have maintained that Germany is fighting a purely defensive war. These know what would happen if the truth leaked out; a fact that explains why they are so afraid of Dr. Liebknecht, and why they are so glad to have him in prison.

But there is evidence for my contention of a more positive character. I think most of us would admit that the anti-war party in-

Germany has been even more active during the progress of the war than the anti-war party in Britain. But in the years immediately preceding the war several anti-militarist demonstrations took place, one at least of which made the rulers tremble and caused them to take steps to appease the people's wrath. On one occasion the Crown Prince had to be publicly rebuked by the Kaiser for sending a message of congratulation to a militarist writer who had advocated larger armaments, so great was the public indignation; while the "Zabern" affair sent a thrill of horror throughout Germany, and for a time threatened the entire Prussian system. After that incident there was no mistaking where the sympathies of the German people lay. Indeed, many sober thinkers are of opinion that that incident had much to do with precipitating the present war. Moreover,—and for these facts I am indebted to the "Peacemaker," the official organ of the Associated Councils of Churches in the British and German Empires for fostering friendly relations between the two peoples—a manifesto was issued in April, 1913, to clergymen, theologians, professors, etc., by Prof. Dr. Weinal, of Jena, and six clergymen, with the request that other signatures be

appended. This manifesto, which is one of the most outspoken I have yet seen, contained the following passages: "The year 1913 . . . brings us new and unexampled armaments. In order to maintain peace among the nations, we are told, there must be a continuous increase in this respect. But the facts indicate that, since all civilised states are acting alike, the peril of war is not diminished, since precisely this constantly heavier burden of armed peace, intensified through reciprocal hatred and mistrust among the peoples, may compel a sanguinary issue, which, in turn, would signify not the end, but the beginning of a new competition in armaments." It also goes on to say that war in no way justifies the sacrifice of human life, "since its professed ends, peace and right, are not guaranteed by its outcome," and later adds: "It is regrettable and painful that hitherto only a numerically insignificant proportion of the German Evangelical Theologians publicly represent the cause of international peace, and that we leave this practical following of Jesus Christ to the non-churchgoing social democracy." And the "Peacemaker" for September, 1913, states that by the end of May, 390 signatures of clergymen, theologians, etc., had been appended.

But what of the military spirit in our own country? Within quite recent years the military have been called out to put down strikes. In the case of the railway strike of 1911 Mr. Asquith announced that the Government "would place the whole civil and military forces of the Crown at the disposal of the railway companies . . . " to assist, that is to say, not the victims of what was generally recognised at the time as gross injustice, but those responsible for that injustice. Then there was the shooting of women and children in the streets of Dublin in 1914, in connection with the Howth gun-running incident. Moreover the victims of this inexcusable outrage had, according to the verdict of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the matter, been guilty of nothing worse than throwing missiles. Then again, the alleged facts in connection with the recent rebellion in Ireland, such as the shooting of a renowned pacifist like Sheehy Skeffington, along with two others, in cold blood and without a trial, the shooting and burying within the precincts of a public house of two innocent men, prove conclusively that war of its very nature renders atrocities inevitable; that bloodshed makes men furious and causes them to do things unspeakable.

There is not much doubt that Germany started this war, but we cannot close our eyes to the policy of fear, nor to the materialism, the greed of gold that has taken possession of all the great Western nations, which made such a war not only possible but inevitable. For many years now, notwithstanding rosy appearances, the great nations of the West have been deteriorating both morally and spiritually. "Business is business" has become the moral law that is above every law. By slow degrees Europe has become the victim of corrupt commercial motives, in consequence of which her civilisation is being undermined, her power to attain the lofty idealism of democracy, of universal brotherhood, rapidly lost. Faster than she realises, Europe is going the way of all the great commercial nations of the past, yielding more and more to the temptations of unbounded material success. When we think of the way large sections of the community pursue wealth to-day—unlimited wealth, be it noted—and with the full protection of the State—we need not wonder at the catastrophe which confronts us, nor at the infidelity which everywhere abounds towards men, better ideals, and all things sacred and spiritual. The happiness, and well-being of the people and the adornment

of the earth, the conversion of the latter into a beautiful habitation for all the sons of toil—the two objects of all true labour—are among the last things that most of our modern commercialists seem to consider ; what they appear chiefly to think about is their gains, the growth of their power. Such is the mind and such the spirit that are dominating Europe at the present time, determining its social and political policies ; and they are as prevalent in Britain as in Germany. I hold that the materialism of the present age, inspired as it is by a corrupt commercialism, is the greatest enemy of the modern world, and will, if it be not checked, and superseded by a finer idealism, bring about the complete downfall of Europe.

In making these observations and comparisons it has not been my object to excuse or exonerate Germany, for no one could hold in more perfect horror such deeds as Germany has been guilty of in the present war, as well as all that we understand by the term Prussianism, than I do. My purpose is to find the best means of stamping out militarism—Prussianism in all its forms ; but I realise that we shall never succeed in doing that if we take a narrow view of the evil, imagine that it is confined within certain geographical limits, and

springs from a single and unqualified desire on the part of one nation to possess and rule the whole earth.

Our enemy is a spirit rather than a nation, and the only way to conquer it is to set against it a better spirit; for, otherwise, we can only intensify it. We must adopt the method of non-violence; and the only reason why people are afraid to trust that method is that they do not quite see how it will work. What they lack, as a means of stimulating faith in such a highly spiritual principle, is a fuller comprehension of the psychological forces it would bring into play. When they ask what you would do if a murderer attacked you they do not seem to realise that two minds, and not one simply, are involved, and that what the supposed murderer did would depend very largely upon what you did. And in any case, how would you know, unless he told you, that murder was his object? But granting that it was, there is every reason to believe that if you never suspected him of such evil intentions, but treated him with respect, as if such things were altogether beneath him, you would soon make murder impossible, abhorrent to his mind. Whereas, if you suspected him of murder, your very suspicion might inspire the

thought, and cause him to do what otherwise he would not have done.

With these simple psychological facts in mind, therefore, let us boldly face the question of an alien invasion, and say how we pacifists believe such an occurrence ought to be met, and what we believe would be the results.

Assuming, then, that our nation was threatened with an alien invasion, and that the people, encouraged by their leaders, religious and other, decided to adopt the pacifist attitude, what would happen? What *could* happen? Very little, surely! Imagine the hosts marching, if you will, and finally confronting a people who neither resisted them nor showed any resentment at their approach, but smiled rather at their folly, and withal were willing to lodge and entertain them—what could such soldiers do? Fire on the people? Impossible! for there would have been no war, no resistance, no provocation, no inflaming of the blood by the fury and desperation of battle. Besides, what would be the good of killing? Would they do it merely for pleasure?

In such circumstances the invaders would be in a sorry plight, and would not in the least know what to do; for the point that would go home to every soldier's heart would be this:

What can be better than to be friends with people who want to be friendly? Of course, the enemy officers would bluster about a little, and some of the worst might, in their anger, blow up a building or two in order to arouse the people's passion, but if no resentment were shown they would soon stop that. And supposing one of the commanders was so rabid as to order the soldiers to exterminate the people, do you seriously believe that enemy working men could go into our homes and, after being kindly and hospitably received by our people, pull out their bayonets and quietly plunge them into their benefactors' bodies? No, it is not in human nature to do any such thing, and has never been done from the dawn of history to the present time.

But would they not rob our homes, our banks, our art galleries, etc., take all our treasure? Granting for the moment that they did, what would be the effect of such a deed? As a fact the conscience of the entire civilised world would be stirred to its depths—and not simply because of the dastardliness of the act, but because of the marvellous heroism our nation had displayed in resisting the temptation to return evil for evil. By sheer force of contrast the deed of the enemy would become

doubly odious, and would cause every nation under the sun to despise her, and to refuse to have communication with her until she had renounced her act and made full reparation. Until that had been done the enemy would be ostracised from the fellowship of the nations, her goods banned and boycotted, her commerce brought to a standstill. Indeed, I would go so far as to say that in less than twelve months everything she had taken, down to the last ounce of gold, would have been returned.

But should we not all be made the slaves of the enemy? How could a people who had the moral courage to rely on the righteousness of their cause, their moral and spiritual resources, and on the humanity of their enemies become the slaves of anyone? The superiority of their character would be manifest to all who witnessed it, and would win the admiration of friend and foe alike. Besides, the good will in which the pacifist believes is not a weak and sickly sentiment but a robust principle under the guidance of reason and a noble ideal. Consequently the pacifist is the last man in the world whom you could enslave.

And what could the invader do with a nation of such people? He could do absolutely nothing; indeed, so afraid would he be lest

the spirit and temper of our people should infect his own troops, and so threaten his dominion over them and over his entire kingdom, that he would be only too glad to leave the country.

But the new policy would have other effects. It would reveal to the common people of both countries their power, the essential unity of human nature, the real source and cause of war. The aggressor would have been exposed, and the effect of that would be to awaken the public mind and overthrow once and for all the vicious ideas and methods of the past.

And that is the only cure of war. What is more, we are capable of adopting it. The nation that can produce five million volunteers who are prepared to give their lives for their country and the cause of right could, once it grasped the reasonableness of the principle, produce twice that number who are capable of adopting the method of pacifism. In such event, were but our orators and journalists to labour as hard for the method of pacifism as they did in the recent war for that of bloodshed, the nation could be brought to the level whence the pacifist principle could be adopted without any doubt whatever. We do not realise the tremendous possibilities of warfare on the moral

74 AHIMSA AND WORLD PEACE

and spiritual plane. A new era lies before us, and we might even now step into it were it not that fear and ignorance stand in the way. Circumstances do not in the least matter; the method of pacifism *must* succeed once a people grasp its meaning and trust it.

THE FUTURE

THE growth of science as applied to the means of human destruction has brought us to this position: that either the nations must exterminate war, or war will exterminate the nations.

At last the future stands exposed; there can be no mistaking its portents. No prophet's eye is required to see whither the path we are now treading leads. Henceforth blindness and ignorance must be without excuse. If we fail to realise the issues now, and go aimlessly forward in the way that has become familiar to us, heedless of consequences, unmistakable warnings, we must not complain when calamity overtakes us. The war that was recently waged in Europe proclaims with clarion voice that if the policies of the past are continued, the fate of the nations is sealed.

The appalling destructiveness of modern

warfare, rendered still more appalling by the length of time that prosperous commercial nations can carry it on, has not only converted war into wholesale murder, unspeakable carnage, wherein Nature, as would seem, in a moment of passionate regret, conspires to undo all the good she has ever done, but into a species of foul commercialism, in which, as is on every hand confessed, the nation with the largest number of men, each with four limbs—and not, as formerly, with stout, believing hearts and strong spirits—and the largest amount of capital, or “credit,” at its command—or, as a modern war expert put it, has the largest number of “silver bullets”—will be victorious. But I say most frankly that to win such wars were no better than to lose them, for the very manner and method of them proves conclusively that they are wrong in spirit and in purpose, and that they can do no other than confirm the victors in the materialism out of which they so obviously spring. The nation that professedly wages war in the belief that success depends upon mere numbers and mere gold has reached an alarming state of moral decadence, and ought to be made to realise the fact. The way modern nations are putting trust in armies and armaments, as if

such things were veritably the most powerful forces in creation, is perhaps the gravest reflection that could be cast upon a people which boasts of a great civilisation. Indeed, our present condition suggests that we are going very far towards fulfilling Mr. Ruskin's alarming prophecy made almost half-a-century ago. Allow me to quote it; it is one of the most illuminating and startling comments upon the present time, with which I am familiar. It is taken from *The Queen of the Air*.

“And farther, note this, which is vital to us in the present crisis: If war is to be made by money' and machinery, the nation which has the largest and most covetous multitude will win. You may be as scientific as you choose; the mob that can pay more for sulphuric acid and gunpowder will at last poison its bullets, throw acid in your faces, and make an end of you—of itself, also, in good time, but of you first. And to the English people the choice of its fate is very near now. It may spasmodically defend its property with iron walls a fathom thick, a few years longer—a very few. No walls will defend either it or its havings against the multitude that is breeding and spreading, faster than the clouds, over the habitable earth. . . . But if we think

more wisely, while there is yet time, and set our minds again on multiplying Englishmen, and not on cheapening English wares; if we resolve to submit to wholesome laws of labour and economy, and, setting our political squabbles aside, try how many strong creatures, friendly and faithful to each other, we can crowd into every spot of English dominion, neither poison nor iron will prevail against us; nor traffic—nor hatred; the noble nation will yet, by the grace of Heaven, rule over the ignoble, and force of heart hold its own against fireballs.”

We have gone far towards fulfilling the first half of this prophecy; will the second half ever be fulfilled? It may be, and very soon, if we are capable of learning the paramount lesson of the recent war, of realising in time the madness and murder of materialism, the folly of armament rivalry. For the choice now lies between a ravaging materialism, unexampled armaments and wars besides which, for sheer horror and destructiveness, even the recent catastrophe must pale into insignificance—the mere preparation for which will consume all the wealth, energy, and substance of the nations—and a finer social and spiritual idealism which carries with it trust of peoples as

a cardinal principle, and thus complete non-violence. There is no middle course. Nor will the latter alternative be for long within our power if we neglect to adopt it. We cannot play with human nature, the deep springs of human action, with impunity. For even though we may see the end approaching, if fear and hatred be allowed to take complete possession of our nation's soul, nothing will be able to avert it.

Far more than we know it, passion and prejudice have gripped our nation's mind and caused thousands who profess not to believe in war to believe in war. What shall prevent these from becoming strong adherents of a large armaments policy when the war is over? What, indeed, but a complete change of attitude, a sincere repentance for having been false to their better selves, their deepest convictions, and a whole-hearted return to those principles?

What, then, would we have our nation do? We would have her cultivate a new kind of strength, pay more attention to her soul and less to things material and their defence; for it is the great-souled nation and not the rich and well-armed nation that will finally conquer. We must take the initiative in a new and

grander way of life ; learn to look upon life in a quite new way, to see in the religion of Ahimsa a challenge, a call to the aspiring and romantic spirit of youth, a golden opportunity for unparalleled adventure. In other words, we need to realise that the world in which we live is not a fixed world, but plastic, capable of infinite change ; that life is bigger and profounder than the modes of conduct with which we are familiar suggest ; that Ahimsa teems with the true spirit of chivalry and points the way to modes and ideals of conduct which surpass anything that we have yet aspired to, reveals to us secrets of our own human nature which, could we but grasp them, would open up untold spiritual possibilities, paths of unexampled heroism. The work of creation is an eternal process, a process in which each one of us is called to take a part, to co-operate with the Divine force that is in the world, and so help in the never-ending task of evolving a more heaven-like earth and a more God-like race.

Now, it is precisely because I believe that religion has been revealed to the present age in a quite new light, been found to embody and rest upon laws of human nature that hitherto had lain hidden from the many, that I

can confidently and fearlessly advocate non-resistance. Indeed, realising the force and meaning of non-violence, I can think of nothing more truly courageous and romantic, or more certain of victory, than a nation of unarmed combatants confronting a nation of armed ones. The sheer daring of meeting physical force with moral and spiritual force would be enough to paralyse any nation. But the secret of physical non-resistance is that it increases moral and spiritual resistance ; that is why it is bound to be successful.

The whole case for non-resistance rests on this indisputable fact : that trust elevates alike those who manifest it and those toward whom it is manifested. Of its very nature trust breaks down prejudices, destroys suspicion, kills a thousand secret fears, and by making possible the flow of a better feeling, unites in bonds of fellowship peoples who otherwise, through ever-deepening estrangement and enmity, might have pursued a policy whose inevitable end is war.

And as in regard to most evils, so in regard to this, if we wish to rid the world of it we must start at home. The nation that is fearless, that dares face its enemies with a simple, strong conviction of right, and in the spirit of goodwill,

is unconquerable. Obviously, as to disarm is to throw off fear, not to create it, for it is to compel a people to live positively, to develop its spiritual resources, to act with strict regard to moral laws and spiritual demands, and thus to create the mind and spirit that are above fear. Naturally, a people self-bereft of material defence would take pains to fortify itself spiritually, erect unpassable and unconquerable mental and spiritual bulwarks, forge armour that would be impregnable, stronger than a thousand ships or countless mammoth guns.

Composed of valiant men and women with kind hearts and a will to act uprightly, no nation, howsoever weakly defended physically, would need to stand in fear, as none would seek to do her injury. But even if one tried, none could subdue her; while to destroy such a nation would be physically and humanly impossible. She would be as a city set on a hill, and would at once take the lead in a new kind of greatness, herald a new social order.

To disarm would be to testify to a belief in the ultimate goodness of human nature; and that in itself would elevate the entire race, give it a new impetus, add to its dignity—for human nature is capable of infinite development or

infinite degeneration, according to how it is treated. Such an act would be taken as an earnest of goodwill and of a better time to be. It would, moreover, be the means of raising the world's battlefield on to the moral and spiritual plane. Thereafter men would fight with spiritual not physical weapons, with arguments and acts of fearless goodwill and not with swords. Every issue would be resolved into a moral issue, while the wrong and the wrongdoer would be exposed before the whole world.

Thus at one stroke non-violence would solve a multitude of problems. It would compel frank and open dealing, demand honesty of purpose and the abandonment of secret and sinister ambitions; it would thus make a democratic foreign policy inevitable. And the effect of these things would be to sweeten public life, purify international relationships and, by destroying fear and hatred, make a closer and more wholesome unity between the nations possible.

Non-violence signifies good faith, trust in human nature, man's awakening to the spiritual greatness of his kind and to the essential unity of the race. And by reason of this awakening it would be recognised that every nation, every human being had an absolute

right to adequate means of self-development. Thus to disarm would be to challenge the very basis of modern society, and could but one nation raise the courage to do it, the act would be universally heralded as a great spiritual achievement. In less than twenty years the nations would be transformed, a free soul would breathe within them. For each nation is saying within itself: we do not want war, we only want security, the right to live freely, and with the full use of our powers; and yet each nation is afraid to take the only step that could guarantee such things.

But it will be asked: What about the backward races? Should we not, by disarming, be throwing ourselves on the tender mercies of of uncivilised hordes?

Not in the least, for as I pointed out in a previous section, people of a higher civilisation have nothing to fear from those of a lower civilisation, provided they treat them respectfully and honourably. The lowest savage has sufficient social instinct to refrain from injuring those who try to live peaceably with, and in goodwill towards him; while superior intelligence and superior civilisation never fail to win admiration, if not indeed to overawe and subdue. Keep your agreements with savages,

respect their customs, etc., and allow them to learn of you, and you need have no fear. The experiences of settlers among such peoples as the Red Indians of America, the Maoris of New Zealand, and numerous African tribes confirm this.

And in regard to the great nations of the East, these are neither savage nor, for the most part, barbarian. The great preponderance of the people are undoubtedly illiterate, but they are civilised, are thrifty, peaceful, and intensely religious, large sections of them being, on religious grounds, wholly opposed to killing. Indeed, the majority of these nations are the inheritors of a civilisation and culture considerably older than our own, and embrace large numbers of highly cultured and refined people. And no one could say that either the Chinese or the Indians were warlike peoples. Nor could that have been said of the Japanese of a few years ago. And what has made Japan a menace to the West? What, indeed, but coming into contact with Western greed and ambition, Western materialism and commercialism? For the most part these Eastern peoples are vegetarian, are keen and skilled agriculturists, and, like the peasantry everywhere, true lovers of peace.

in regard to the armament question. Were we of the West to put an end to our rabid rivalry in armaments, it is more than likely that the Eastern nations, or at any rate China and India, would never embark upon a militarist policy at all; while Japan, in case Europe disarmed, would be compelled to follow suit. Whereas, if the present policy continue, and the East once enters into conflict with the West, an era of unexampled frightfulness will set in.

Thus it is imperative that we at once rationalise our attitude towards these great peoples. The insane antipathy of the past must be cast aside. For even the raving Imperialist must admit that it is impossible to exterminate or permanently repress eight hundred millions of people, especially people with a tradition, a venerable and ancient culture. From their past attainments, as well as from their present aspirations and achievements, we know that these peoples are capable of great things, and in any case that they have as much right to a place on this globe, with reasonable opportunities of self-development, as we have. Why not forestall disaster, therefore, by at once instituting a policy of open dealing and frank co-operation? But in order to do this effectively we must disarm; for, how otherwise can

we convince these people of our good faith, and ourselves steer clear of evil ambitions, the machinations of unscrupulous commercialists?

At present, owing chiefly to decadent religious systems that have apparently cut too deep into the ruts of habit and custom for salvation to come from within, the East has become earth-bound, thought-locked. Thus, were we to treat the Eastern nations sympathetically, throw open our culture to them, and thereby give them just the help they need, we might win their lasting gratitude.

But if, instead, we aim at exploiting the East, and at home continue our suicidal armament-vieing policy, whereby, within forty or fifty years, we may be involved in one or more wars on an even greater scale than the recent one, then, and then only, will the East become a menace to the West.

There is not a single tangible reason why a modern civilised nation should not disarm; for the spirit and courage that would make disarmament possible would be a nation's guarantee of safety were it to take that course. The final and irrefutable argument for disarmament is that fearlessness, absolute trust in moral and spiritual forces, and in the ultimate integrity of human nature, are invincible.

VII

THE ONLY WAY

THE spirit of vengeance that the recent conflict has engendered has finally and completely broken down the contention that war can end war. At a very early stage in the war's progress, the professed cause of the war ceased to be the chief motive for carrying it on. But we need not be surprised at this, as war is self-feeding, creates as it proceeds the necessity for its continuance. So long as there are men who are willing to fight, and people who, for one reason and another, want them to go on fighting, war itself provides ample excuse for the latter to have their way. Bloodshed always did and always will excite the worst passions, unbalance and madden the most perfectly poised minds; and if it can cause men to commit atrocities in a small Irish rebellion, what may we expect of a conflagration which spreads across a continent?

The recent war has created sufficient hatred to keep fear active and the war spirit alive for many decades, and a desperate effort has to be made to revolutionise the public mind. Time after time, the continuation of the war has been demanded because of atrocities; the logic of which is, considering the nature and inevitable consequences of the shedding of human blood, that the war ought to be fought to "the last man and the last shilling." Even now we are in the coils of a vicious circle from which we must either quickly escape or bleed to death. In other words, we must either take definite steps to restore and increase the confidence between the democracies of the world that was just beginning to be self-conscious when the war came, or prepare for a period of unexampled terror.

I have already argued that the most effective way to restore this confidence is to disarm. But I would go further and say that there is no other. The idea seems to be abroad that confidence in one another between the nations can spring out of an all-round exhibition of strength. But it is a false idea, as the most physically powerful nation is bound ultimately to be the most covetous; and such a nation would be a menace and a source of fear, even to her spirit-

ually superior neighbours ; that is, if the latter accepted the "necessity for large armaments" theory. And fear is the disintegration of the soul ; nothing sweet and wholesome can grow in its presence. Large standing armies have their origin in fear, and are intended to excite fear ; they arouse suspicion, disquiet the nerves, especially in a crisis, and make it almost impossible at such times to avoid a conflict. Indeed, they are the chief cause of crises, as the consciousness of the disaster they are capable of effecting, should a hitch occur, tends to create a tense atmosphere even on the most trivial occasions. And is it not generally believed that if at the commencement of the recent conflict hostilities could have been delayed a few days longer, the outbreak of war might have been prevented ? But the armies being already on the move, and waiting, as it were, like dogs in the leash, for the word to dash forth, and everybody being in a state of keen excitement in consequence, what but a miracle could have prevented war ?

And so long as these conditions obtain, and large standing armies are the rule, neither Peace Boards, Conferences, Tribunals, nor any other device can conceivably prevent war—at any rate permanently. They might succeed in

postponing it, in certain cases, but under no condition could they end it. But not only do large armies excite fear, they are a great temptation to, and an instrument of evil in, the hands of exploiters and reactionaries. These latter, for the sake of self-aggrandisement, the subjugation of the people, or the attainment of some equally sinister end, would plot and counter-plot, and leave no stone unturned to bring about a war if that would serve their ends. To such an extent does materialism madden and dehumanise men.

Nor would the creation of a World Convention be any guarantee of peace under these conditions, as the tendency would be for the Powers to fall into groups for the purpose of securing mutual advantages. And the outcome of this would be more plotting than ever, while owing to the manifestations of friendship within the groups, there would be even more antagonism between the nations. Consequently fear would increase. The only way to prevent plotting of this kind is to take away the instrument that makes it possible, viz., the threat of war. If that were done, both financial cliques and nations would either have to act uprightly or withstand the odium of public exposure. And now that we have experienced a world

war, have discovered that we can tolerate the merciless butchering and maiming of millions of men, anything is possible in the way of human destruction, the road having been cleared for huge conflicts between groups of Powers whose representatives happened to have lost their heads in a World Convention. And as, owing to the terrible destructiveness of modern warfare, the tendency of the future is sure to be towards nations forming themselves into groups, of what avail will be such schemes as that recently proposed by President Wilson? We shall not in the future have to deal with recalcitrant nations, but with recalcitrant groups of nations; and to interfere with such a group would, of course, be nothing less than to enter upon a world war.

Mr. H. G. Wells, in his book, *What is Coming?*, speaks of certain combinations of Powers, between which "the war-threat" . . . "will be so plain and definite," that he does not see why the standing conference of the several groups should not ultimately become the "nucleus of the world State for which at present we search the world in vain." That at least sounds plausible, but so long as we have such corrupt commercialism, such shameless grasping after wealth and power as we have

to-day, no war-threat will prevent war, but will be used for selfish and despicable ends.

And there is this also to be said, that the greater the war-threat the more will the peoples be subject to fear, and the more likelihood will there be of a hitch in diplomatic relations developing into a crisis and leading to war. In fact, I think it might almost be laid down as a law that owing to the effect of fear on the human mind, to increase the war-threat would be to multiply wars and so prevent the formation of a World State.

Thus I contend that disarmament is the only way to end war. But as to do that requires a large measure of moral courage, it will, as in cases of private morality, have to be undertaken by the nation which first realises that that is the only road to salvation from the rule of brute force, the nation which, seeing the light is prepared to walk in it. We shall never bring the Powers to take such a step in concert, as before the morally timid nations have been won over to the idea the morally superior ones will have lost their enthusiasm for it, and thus their strength. As is the case in regard to individual conduct, so is it the case here, the enlightened nation must take the initiative, and if it refuses to do so it will miss

a great opportunity, and degenerate in consequence.

It thus remains for us who do not believe in war to use every means of public and private discussion within our power to increase the number of those who do not believe in the moral and spiritual efficacy of the sword, so that eventually it may be strong enough to give effect to a policy of disarmament. We must be passive pacifists no longer, for if we take the view that it is our duty to fight with the sword simply because a war has been declared, we shall never be rid of war till the crack of doom. No matter how many wars we have, we shall be told on every occasion what we are being told to-day, viz., that its object is to destroy militarism and preserve civilisation, whereas we know that its real tendency will be to destroy civilisation and establish militarism more firmly. The inevitable end of war is to break down trust, check the growth of co-operative effort, and by giving free rein to lust, selfishness and evil passion, to lower the moral standards, weaken the spiritual constitution of the nations which participate in it. And we all ought to know by this time that war does not destroy the evils which call it forth. War is the rule of

the wildest and the worst passions, in consequence of which it cannot possibly do good; for once passion gains the ascendancy, ere it is realised, the Powers of Darkness accomplish things unspeakable, throw entire nations into a state of moral stupefaction, draw them into a form of Devil-worship.

But there is this to be said on the other side—and I say it frankly—that if the principles of pacifism are to prevail, pacifists must take a much more active part in uprooting the evils which make war possible than they have done. The recent war, for instance, has exposed a thousand wrongs and evils, and compelled many, who before were blind to the fact, to realise the terrible state of materialism into which all the nations alike had fallen. These evils, therefore, ought to be regarded by the pacifist as a challenge to his principles, and as a golden opportunity for him to vindicate those principles. For to be successful in attacking, exposing and stamping out the evils which spring from materialism, is not only to prove the efficacy of pacifist methods but to remove the fundamental causes of war.

Man being a developmental being, who grows by conflict and struggling, the substitution of new and finer ideas for old and worn-out

ones, fighting of some kind will always be necessary, as new ideas, howsoever full of the promise of life they may be to those who discover them, are bound to be regarded as the forerunners of disaster by those who do not think, or are content with such comfort as has been vouchsafed to them. But that is no argument for the exercise of physical force, as man, having at last become a cultured soul, essentially a spiritual being, with ample spiritual and mental powers, has no need to defend right and truth by means of steel and gunpowder.

In the first issue of *To-day*, Mr. G. K. Chesterton said that one of his chief objections to pacifism was that he believed in revolution; he was, he said, in favour of a revolution against the Servile State.

So are we; but what help is there in a bloody revolution? The pacifism to which I am committed is of a very active type, and is, I am quite convinced, capable of doing 'more real and lasting good than can be hoped for by any method which involves the taking of human life. I greatly admire Mr. Chesterton for his splendid defence of many of our fundamental rights, but I part company with him when he insists on including the exercise of physical force as a means of upholding right, among his

cherished deities. For a man of Mr. Chesterton's literary and intellectual ability to pay such homage to physical force is really astounding.

For my part, I see no chance of improving society by means of a bloody revolution. Mr. Chesterton would evidently begin to improve the world by killing the men whose lives are the embodiment of lies. I would prefer to begin by killing the lies that are mutilating the men. And certainly, for the most part, the men are to be pitied, as, living in a morally decadent age, they have been fed on lies from their infancy, given a quite false estimate of life's values. That being the case, were it not better to try and send light into such men's minds than to send lead into their bodies? To think of men like Mr. Chesterton vainly struggling to do the latter when they are so admirably fitted to do the former, is most depressing. Besides, once the practice of blood-letting is started it is most difficult to put an end to it, as every section in the community naturally wants its turn, as was the case in the French Revolution; and as each faction comes to power it seeks to rid the world of its own, rather than of the world's, enemies.

Non-violence is the revolution we want. We

desire a full and widespread recognition of the values which Christ preached and a common-sense application of the principles He laid down. We must endeavour to make Christianity a real and living force, rescue it from the obloquy into which it has sunk, save it from the mockery which a materialistic age has made of it. When one thinks of the things that were done before the war in the name of civilisation, even by men in high places, and of the way such men have plundered our nation in the greatest crisis in its history, our hearts bleed, cry out against such perfidy, and declare that no good can come out this war, or out of anything else, for that matter, so long as the existing materialism continues. The only hope of the future is to be found in the adoption of a loftier ideal, in the discovery and acceptance of a superior conception of values. And at all costs a nobler race must rise, a more wholesome code of morals, and a richer, sweeter life for the great majority of the people prevail. New social demands must be made and every man be called upon to declare whether he be for society or against it. The morals of the world must be measured by the test of non-violence, and the actions and not the heads of men held up to the public gaze.

And just as I think it far more chivalrous and Christian to discuss bad times and the different ways of obtaining a living with a burglar who happens to have entered one's house, than to fling about revolver shots and run for the nearest policeman, so I think it far more chivalrous and religious, but infinitely more difficult, to discuss moral values and the social need with the exploiter, than to send bombs through his parlour window.

The pacifist is a real adventurer, the true knight-errant of the modern age, as it requires far more courage to act upon the principles he professes than it does to act in the ways that have become customary. It takes more courage to challenge an enemy, single-handed, with the truth, than it does to take part in a bayonet charge; although at first thought it may not seem so. Thus when Mr. Chesterton says, as he does in the article above referred to, that in his opinion the man who would not strike a blow to save a woman from torturers, is as bad as the torturers, one feels that for once Mr. Chesterton has been forsaken of his imagination.

For there are obviously many ways in which a man might save a woman from torturers. Indeed pacifism makes a tremendous claim upon the imagination, as it demands modes of

conduct of a quite new order, being, as we have seen, the substitution of spiritual for physical methods of vindicating right. And I frankly confess that my pacifism chiefly springs from an insuppressible admiration for Christ's beautiful and courageous romanticism. I believe Christ's life was full of true romance and of the very highest kind of courage; I also believe Christ's saying about turning the other cheek to be based on sound psychology. The man who dare carry out that teaching possesses the true crusading spirit of a St. George.

If war is ever to be banished from the earth it will not be by means of a great last war, but by the creation of a new spirit, the recognition of new realities and values. Goodwill, fellowship, brotherhood, democracy, the great verities of the future must be made living realities now, for only as they are made such shall we feel that life is sacred and spiritual, and shall we develop the power to fight for right, truth and freedom, on the spiritual plane. We must create within the nations a faith in each other, in human nature, that no fear or hatred or desire for vengeance can break down, an all-conquering faith in humanity. But the secret of such faith is faith in oneself. Who conquers his own fear conquers all things—the world, life, death

and all evil. The spiritually strong man is the strongest man of all, for he manifests the mind and the spirit that all men instinctively recognise as the noblest and profoundest things life possesses; consequently such an one conquers, breaks down all opposition, sooner or later. And what is true of individuals in this respect is true of nations. Thus no national hatred will bear examination; it is based on ignorance and prejudice, and nothing, save goodwill, nobly and valiantly upheld by the faith that comes of spiritual enlightenment, can suppress and overcome it.

Born of greed and pride, which work through fear, and having for its offspring hatred, war in a civilised age is a wholly destructive force. For hatred is a poison, and, as such, can only destroy. Like love it begets its own kind only; and being highly contagious its power of destruction is without limits. It is a hydra-headed monster which no sword can exterminate; a frenzied fiend from whose nostrils are exhaled the vampid vapours of disease and death. Indeed everything that is done in war as the outcome of hate will be as a huge barricade of evil in the path to peace and will prevent the further advancement of civilisation until, through the persistent efforts of goodwill, it has

been removed. Hate is war eternal, the closing of all the avenues along which a right understanding might be reached.

Thus I hold that permanent international peace is not something for which we must look to the Courts of the Great Powers, to Kings and Parliaments, or even to Peace Conferences and Conventions, but, to the men and women who make up the several nations. Yea, even international peace is of the heart, and like the Kingdom of Heaven which Christ preached, must be possessed individually; it will manifest itself outwardly as soon as the people experience it, generate it inwardly. It is not a Bill to be passed by a Government or Governments, but a spirit to be cultivated and possessed. We are all called to be ambassadors of peace; and if we neglect our duty, why blame others? No Government, howsoever bellicose, would ever dream of going to war if the spirit of peace was in the people. So long as the people are fickle, prone to hate, unpractised in the art of self-control, so long will they be at the mercy of war-mongers, and be subject to war. When goodwill, which is the spirit of peace, is in the majority of the people, war will naturally and inevitably pass away. But until then it cannot pass away. And that spirit will manifest itself

in one nation first, and will cause that nation to modify its policy accordingly, to disarm, and thus to take the lead in the march towards a lovelier life, a grander civilisation.

Thus, my concluding word is that lasting peace will dawn upon the world when those who profess to believe in peace, practise peace, trust the forces and principles upon which it rests, and are strong enough to withstand the tidal waves of evil passion which seem periodically to burst upon us; are able to overrun the land with the purifying streams of goodwill, and so check the growth of hatred, pride, vainglory, greed and the lust for power. We may all sign the treaty of permanent peace to-day; and keep it, too. And the death-knell of war will never be rung until a sufficient number do that. For the conditions of peace are internal not external, private not official, individual not national: they are men and women whose minds are well-controlled and whose hearts are charged with unshakable goodwill towards men.

THE VICTORY OF PEACE: Three Poems

The Victory of Peace

I

AN UNINVITED GUEST

Wrapped in clouds of thund'rous hue,
Coming like a King long due,
Sped a Spirit through the night,
Giving life to earth's dim light.
Then, behold, the clouds unrolled,
And into view stepped one I knew.
From thence I followed, wild, distraught,
To catch the light I long had sought,
Yet sought in vain.

Soon we stopped; beneath us lay,
Deep in slush, and cold as clay,
Men in trenches, weary, sick,
Agonised by rifle-click;
Then there rolled, as from a mould,
A body stark into the dark :
The men around with frenzied stare,
Gazed on the form in blank despair :
Then 'cross the lines a bullet sped ;
The Spirit turned away his head,
And breathed a prayer.

Rushing o'er the mighty main,
From the sight of dead men slain,
Soon we saw in high seas raging,
Fiendish guns red battle waging.
Then a blaze dispelled the haze,
Revealed a ship in death's grim grip :
A thousand men from off her lea,
Despairing, leapt that icy sea ;
Midst smoke and gloom and roaring wind
They fought and cried : afar, behind,
I heard a moan.

Ere I knew it we had sped
To a region of the dead ;
Wooden crosses marked the way
Where ten thousand brothers lay.
Shattered homes and battered domes,
Blood-stained streets where no one greets,
And hundred signs of war's wild pace
Befouled that erstwhile peaceful place :
A cry of ravens rent the air
Where once had risen breath of prayer :
The Spirit sighed.

Near at hand a sadder sight
Drew us earthward in our flight ;
Swarming o'er the drenched sod,
Robbed of loved ones, home, and God,
Women wandered, children pondered,
Mute as stone towards black unknown :
Just on and on like dumb things going,
No star ahead, no comfort knowing ;
Forsaken, hungry, numb with pain,
They fell and rose and fell again :

The Spirit groaned.

Scarce away—in thousand cars,
Groaning 'neath the silent stars,
Wounded men in torment lay,
Hoping not for night nor day.
On before, the stench of gore
Came to swell the tale of hell,
As surgeons in the crowded tents
Bored deeper still the war-made rents.
Behind were waggons piled with limbs ;
Hard by the chaplains chanted hymns :
My Master wept.

Then the Spirit, mournful, crushed,
Forth into the dark night rushed ;
O'er the garish streets he went
To a church, well lit,—'twas Lent.
Clad in white, 'midst candle light,
Priests said prayers quite unawares ;
At length the Bishop preached with zeal
Concerning this our Commonweal,
And begged young men the sword to wield
For love of Christ—and ne'er to yield—
My Master swooned.

* * * * *

Anon on heavy wing He rose,
In cumbrous circles o'er His foes,
With drooping head.

II

WEEP IF YOUR EYES HAVE TEARS

Weep if your eyes have tears,
While bearers go with heavy eyes
Across charred plains, 'neath unknown skies,
To save the maimed before sunrise
From further fears !

Weep though you long for play ;
And think to-night that while you sleep,
A thousand men through red blood deep,
Will bring *their comrades home to reap*
A bed of clay !

Weep though your hearts be gay :
A lad of tender years this night
Lies silent in the pale moonlight—
The bearers sicken at the sight,
And turn away !

Weep though you dare not tell :
For, as dawn hastens men rush fast ;
The full-orbed moon looks down aghast,
And seems to ask : "How long will't last
This reign of hell ?"

Weep though you see the light ;
 For those red rays of smiling sun
 Announce a battle new begun—
 Whence blood of brothers fresh will run,
 To foul the night !

Weep though the bugle calls,
 And men go forth in bright array
 To beat their foes and come away—
 But then it comes their turn one day :
 For each one falls !

Weep though your tears be spent—
 Yes, weep that men, who fight each other,
 Can't in a " foe " detect a brother,
 Or see that race has but one mother,
 One common bent !

III

WAR AND PEACE

A POEM IN DIALOGUE

War :

And so 'tis true ! I ne'er did hope to rise
Again so soon. Deep sleep hath scarce mine eyes
Forsak'n ; yet here in frenzy of delight
I'm called to life, to plunge in blackest night
Vast Continents. Such scope I never had.
With new-born power, and dreams that turn him mad,
Man knows no bounds, but e'er with growing mind
Makes new inventions with intent to bind
His fellows to his will. So was it ever ;
So will it ever be. Yes, " Now or never ! "
That's the eternal doom ? But I must haste
Me to my task lest ardour run to waste
And rob me of mine heritage. Speed on,
Ye War Lords, kill with sword and fire ! Begone,
Fair Hate, in whitest garments clad ! Set well
The pace while yet the game is new ; though hell
Arise nought then can stay our course. 'Tis good !
A thousand days of life we'll seek, or, should
The Fates decree, for ten long years we'll drink
Of blood, bring sick Refinement to the brink
Of death, and give the earth, by blood renewed,

To men of valour, sworn to keep the feud.
We've done't before, who then shall say us nay?
But here comes Peace, too late by many a day!

Peace :

What treachery is this? With ruthless hand
You've forged black lies and sent them through the land!
With one fell stroke you've wrecked the work of years!
Truth you've despoiled, her followers plunged in tears!

War ;

The lies I'll answer to ; but, mark me well,
They are as gnats to those thy flock didst tell
In shameless deeds ; and will—if thou be wise—
Through me, purge thy dread cause of filthy guise.
Dost thou not know the curse of this our age?
Canst thou not read the doom that's on its page?
Hast thou not seen the world more servile grow?
Old Mammon raise his brazen head, aglow
With pride? crass ignorance, with shekels backed,
Ride conqueror through the land? your Christ, well
packed
In bed of rosy words, grow sick and dumb?
The Church the tool of plutocrats become?
And all the forces of the State conspire
To sap the people's strength in slavish hire?
Far better steep the land in blood, with ten
Men left to hold a cause, than with fine pen
Fill ledgers for a crew accursed!

Peace :

Call these not mine, for on such horde long since
Mine anger hath been cast ; nor will I mince
My words concerning their vile deeds. But give

Me time ; such men, though scárcely fit to live,
Must yet be saved. And see what I have done
Already ! how the people's mind I've won,
Made bloodshed barb'rous, hate a crime,
And nobler spirit fashioned for the time
To be !

War :

But that is war, as spirited as e'er
Was waged !

Peace :

That I do grant. But 'tis not bloody.

War :

So much the worse. Blood sanctifies a cause,
And raises man above vain shows, weak laws
Which crush the spirit, product of an age
Long lost to truth. The will to war is gauge
Of health, of power to reach to better things,
Life's great realities.

Peace :

An' were that true hast thou alone that power ?
May not I, too, give life-throbs for a dower
To lusty courage ? Think thee ! Who performed
A nobler work, the people's conscience stormed
More sure, their spirits raised to loftier heights,
Than Luther, Wesley, Knox, and lesser lights,
And Goethe, Tolstoy, Ruskin, old Carlyle,
Sworn foes of vile transacting ?

War :

But these were warriors of as fierce a school

As Cæsar, Bonaparte, men born to rule
With iron hand. They fought nor mercy showed,
But slew their foe with venom'd shafts that owed
No debt to Nemesis. And pain is not
Less pain if words instead of rifle-shot
Do cause it.

Peace :

So much I freely grant. But sharpened words
Kill lies, and such unspiritual growth as herds
In darkened souls, yet leave the life intact,
That through the living truth an old-world fact—
The restoration of a soul—may be
Again recorded ; which, as seems to me,
Is God's most righteous way. And this is clear :
That from the soul the lies which men hold dear
Through pain must e'er be driven. Whereas the sword
A two-fold wrong commits—it slays the horde
Of innocents whose only crime is blind
Obedience to high powers, and from their kind
In startling numbers tears them, causing each
To leave a band to mourn him, oft in reach
Of haunting poverty ; thus doomed to pain
Through creeping years. Then, too, I hold 'tis vain
To strike the body for a fault of mind,
Nor good example show, nor aim to find
And teach the truth that into lovelier tracks
Might lead. Think not no lofty purpose racks
My soul, or that because the word I'd sheath,
The right to fight for truth I thus bequeath.
For nobler warfare than of old I wage,
Nor feel ashamed in face of wrong to rage
With righteous anger. Tearing down false gods,
Who fatten on men's souls and fling their pods

Of flesh in gaping graves ; or fixing sure
A loftier ideal, destined man to lure
To verdant paths of rich-hued life, is not
A work for babes, nor yet for cannon-shot ;
But calls for skill and courage greater far
Than e'er was needed on war's slaughter car ;
For war is fever, which, when't grips the mind
Spurs on to action, furious, blind ;
But on the moral plane one works alone,
And fights till death without death's fame, unknown.

War :

Then where's your host ? If what you say is true,
Your warriors I would see ; a doughty crew
I have no doubt you've mustered.

Peace :

Not so, my valiant enemy. For thou
Art still too strong for my great cause ; yet now
I'll tell thee : though to-day thou victor art,
The time will come, and is not far apart,
When thou accurst wilt be. A noble work
Thou once didst do, but thousand devils lurk
Where once a heavenly host didst dwell. When man
Was enemy of man, and sought to ban
From earthly habitation—by honour bound—
Who took his fruits, or spoils, were't man or hound,
No rights of life or power of love beyond
The clan were known ; but since, a finer bond,
Which stronger has become with growth of years,
Has bridged that ancient hatred, banished fears
Wherein is soul of war, and thus at last
Made love's reign possible. Yet still the past
Lies close, and creeps with sinuous movement where,

Forsooth, it has no right. But this I swear :
Ere long a conquering faith in human kind
Will leave your savage creed, all spent, behind,
And carry man to heights where greed will prey,
Not on his innocence. For e'en to-day
The thought of war makes man ashamed, belies
The sacred voice of conscience, nay, defies
The glorious work of time. Is love for nought
But trifling? Has fair art, or commerce, brought
No better thing than hate? Such vaunting cant
I will not countenance. Love is no plant
Of such weak roots that perfidy or small
Souled men can poison it, and so end all.
Yet, lacking faith in what the heart holds dear,
Men still trust those who, giving reign to fear,
Bring to the dust, and oft to deep disgrace,
What otherwise would elevate the race.
And this we know, that man from pole to pole
Is made for love, and worth a better role
Than murdering half his fellows. As for me,
I'd sooner perish, ignorant, trusting man
In name of love, than live a double span
Of seventy years in slime of hate and greed.
A faithless race are they who, born to read
A nobler truth, long lost to history's page
By reason of new dawn of heathen age,—
(Yet come to birth at last through growth of mind
And spirit)—fear to trust it, but with blind
Belief in power tread the ancient way
Of blood. What profits thus their feeble lay
To Christ's democracy? If Christ shall win
'Twill be by faithful deeds and not by din
Of loud-lunged patriots.

War :

Your Christ is out of date, a misanthrope,
Who, by fair words and deeds that none can hope
The crowd will ever copy, has the world's
Imagination caught.

Peace :

That word is false. As sure as morrow's day,
The things He spake will win a widening way,
And conquer hell and these at last. Reck not
O'er high the present time, nor scent the pot
Too soon the Fates are stirring ; or methinks
Sore disappointment may o'ertake thee.

War :

What trash ! Is not a bloodier day at hand
Than e'er was witnessed ? Wherefore, then, this grand
Display of eloquence ?

Peace :

Hadst thou but eyes thou wouldst not ask. Then mark
My words ! For many years, through thickening dark,
Man's labouring mind has struggled towards the light ;
And light at last is dawning. Thus, with might
Unflinching, up he soon will soar to mounts
Of dazzling splendour—heights where no man counts
It honour brother man to fight with steel ;—
Whence, knowing right, will fight for right, nor feel
His duty done till right hath been restored.
E'en now, some see that, at the best, the sword
Is but the symbol of man's disbelief
In fellow man. And so ere long, like reef
Of coral rising from its ocean bed,

The truth concerning thee will lift its head
Above the ling'ring shades of ignorance.
In that day men will know that to enhance
The good in spiritual age the sword can nought
Avail : that unity and glory brought
With blood will quickly fly ; that more
Disaster comes by force than good implore
It as you will. I will not hear the tale
Of all your virtues ; for at best they pale
Beside the burdened list of all your crimes.
With one fell swoop you wreck the work of time's
Hard building ; tear a million hearts in twain ;
Make human nature black, unworthy ; strain
The bonds of faith ; crush out the hope of wife
And youth in servile toil, and cheapen precious life
To valiant men. You ope ' the fount of lust,
Sow hate and greed upon the wind, and trust
To foulest passion, making vile the once
Fair form of virtue. Truth is for the nonce
A truant, fled with Justice on swift wing
From thy foul presence. Hence the wrong that's done
You swell ; for ere your battle's well begun
You've sown the seeds of greater ills to be,
And made a joke of love's fraternity.
And so in thousand ways you undermine
The soul's foundation, lay a crippling fine
Upon a people's fame and thus destroy
The work of mellow years

' War :

'Tis true I've conquered, yet is that not life,
The effort thus to triumph in the strife
For place and power ? So if you mean my soul
To cast from this fair realm, a longer roll

Of knights you'll need than any you've yet shown.
But fear doth not unnerve me, with my own
Resource I'll meet your every move. I shrink
Not from the task, nor tremble on the brink
Of this most bloody time. Ha, ha ! the thought
Is charged with humour. Seems to me I ought
A gift to make thee for the spice thy pains
Thus give to this our life,

Peace :

Vent not thy soul in feeble mockery,
Nor think thy vaunted ways of treachery
Will evermore succeed. The time is ripe
For better things than bloody wars, spent type
Of human reckoning ; and better things
Must come, or what is best will take to wings,
And leave us death for heritage. Such fate
Has been ; and Death is still insatiate.
Thy power to quicken waning life is spent ;
One with the horde of hell thou art, content
To spoil the noblest works of time so be
Thou gain a moment's frenzied ecstasy.
Yet think not to pursue thy course unchecked ;
Thy monstrous aims shall be revealed, and wrecked !
A little while and thy true visage ' fore
The world shalt stand : thou then wilt reign no more.
For, once exalted to a loftier plane,
To slimy depths man ne'er will sink again,
But, seeing visions of a lovelier clime
Will upward move, and build in that new time
A life, a mind, a liberty profound
That heretofore in dreams alone was found :
The liberty of love.
